FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

October 27, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

JASIM MOHAMMED HASSI RAMADON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ANDRE STANCIL, Executive Director Colorado Department of Corrections; PHILIP J. WEISER, Attorney General of the State of Colorado,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 26-1016
(D.C. No. 1:25-CV-03780-LTB)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY*

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **PHILLIPS**, and **MORITZ**, Circuit Judges.

Jasim Mohammed Hassi Ramadon, a Colorado prisoner, applied in district court for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. His petition was undated but filed in the district court on November 21, 2025. The same day, a magistrate judge entered an order concluding that Mr. Ramadon's petition was deficient because (1) it was not signed or dated; (2) Mr. Ramadon named an improper respondent; and (3) he had neither paid the filing fee nor applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The court's order directed him to

* This order is not binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

cure those deficiencies within thirty days and warned that his action would be dismissed without further notice if he did not do so. On December 31, 2025, the district court dismissed Mr. Ramadon's petition without prejudice because he had not cured the identified deficiencies.

Mr. Ramadon applies for a certificate of appealability (COA) to challenge that dismissal, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). We deny a COA because he has not shown "that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

Mr. Ramadon indicates he sent the required filing fee to the district court three times between December 3 and December 31, 2025, but that it was returned each time, first because he sent the fee before he had a case number; second because, although he provided the case number, the court did not correctly identify his case to process the fee; and third because his case had already been dismissed before the court received his payment the third time. Mr. Ramadon therefore argues his habeas application was dismissed only as a result of the district court's "clerical error." COA Appl. at 2.

But even assuming Mr. Ramadon's arguments about the filing fee are correct, he has not addressed the other deficiencies that led the district court to dismiss his habeas petition, namely that it named an improper respondent and was neither signed nor dated. Because he neither disputes those deficiencies nor indicates they were ever corrected, reasonable jurists would not debate the correctness of the district court's procedural ruling. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2242 (requiring signature); Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rules 2(a) (identifying proper respondents), (c)(5) (requiring signature under penalty of

perjury), and (d) (requiring habeas petitions to substantially follow the court-provided form); *see also* R. at 10, 13; D.C.COLO.LCivR 1.2.

Mr. Ramadon also maintains that his habeas petition was timely when he filed it, in "late Nov[ember] 2025," but would now be time-barred. COA Appl. at 3(a). But we need not—and do not—address here either the timeliness of his petition or whether he is entitled to equitable tolling, as those issues were not raised in district court. *See United States v. Johnson*, 157 F.4th 1309, 1316 (10th Cir. 2025) ("We generally do not consider issues not passed upon below." (internal quotation marks omitted)).

We deny Mr. Ramadon's application for a COA and dismiss this matter. We grant Mr. Ramadon's motion to proceed without prepayment of costs or fees, in this instance choosing to overlook his failure to sign that motion under penalty of perjury.

Entered for the Court

Gregory A. Phillips
Circuit Judge