

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Jason Wayne Hachmeister v. Thomas Williams

Hachmeister v. Williams · No. 25-3112-JWL · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas denies Jason Wayne Hachmeister’s motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing his federal habeas petition as untimely. The court holds that Hachmeister’s Kansas collateral-review motion was filed after the federal habeas limitations period had expired and therefore did not statutorily toll that period under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). The court grants his motions for leave to file excess pages and orders that the matter remain closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John W. Lungstrum
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	25-3112-JWL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition as untimely. He also moved twice for leave to file excess pages.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Rule 59(e), relief is available only upon an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence that could not previously have been obtained through due diligence, or a need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice. New arguments or evidence that could have been presented before judgment do not support Rule 59(e) relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court memorandum and order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

statute of limitations

motion for reconsideration

post-conviction relief

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal habeas corpus

Post-conviction relief

Civil procedure

Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Hachmeister satisfied the requirements for altering or amending the prior judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Whether Hachmeister's K.S.A. 60-1507 motion statutorily tolled the federal habeas limitations period under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2) even though it was filed after the federal limitations period had expired.
3. Whether Kansas pandemic-related filing orders or the reasoning of *Jimenez v. Quarterman* altered the date on which Hachmeister's federal habeas limitations period began or restarted.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to alter or amend the judgment was denied because Hachmeister identified no intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, clear error, or manifest injustice.
2. A state post-conviction application filed after the one-year federal habeas limitations period has expired does not toll or revive that limitations period under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2).
3. Kansas administrative orders affecting the timeliness of state K.S.A. 60-1507 filings did not alter the federally prescribed one-year limitations period for filing a § 2254 petition.
4. *Jimenez v. Quarterman* did not postpone or restart Hachmeister's federal habeas limitations period because no state court reopened his direct appeal and a K.S.A. 60-1507 proceeding is collateral review rather than a direct appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court does not agree with Petitioner’s argument that that a “properly filed application” can be “pending” before it is filed.”

“This argument ignores the fact that the federal habeas statute of limitations had already expired by the time Petitioner filed his K.S.A. 60-1507 motion. Simply put, there was nothing to toll”

“Petitioner has shown no persuasive reason for the Court to alter or amend the judgment in this matter.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A Kansas jury convicted Hachmeister of first-degree murder in 2015, and he received a sentence of life imprisonment without parole for 50 years. The Kansas Supreme Court affirmed the conviction in 2020, and Hachmeister did not seek United States Supreme Court review. He filed a state K.S.A. 60-1507 motion in May 2022, after the federal one-year habeas limitations period had expired on November 3, 2021, and then filed his federal § 2254 petition in May 2025.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner was convicted of first-degree murder in Kansas state court, and the Kansas Supreme Court affirmed the conviction on June 5, 2020. He filed a Kansas K.S.A. 60-1507 motion on May 25, 2022, and a federal § 2254 petition on May 29, 2025. This Court previously dismissed the federal petition with prejudice as untimely, declined to issue a certificate of appealability, and entered judgment on November 6, 2025. The Court granted the motions for leave to file excess pages but denied the Rule 59(e) motion and left the case closed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- State v. Hachmeister, 311 Kan. 504, 505 (2020)
- Clark v. Oklahoma, 468 F.3d 711, 714 (10th Cir. 2006)
- Hamilton v. Wyandotte Cnty. Dist. Ct., 2025 WL 1707399, at *5 (D. Kan. June 18, 2025) (unpublished)
- In re McDonald, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989)
- Hartsel Springs Ranch of Colo., Inc. v. Bluegreen Corp., 296 F.3d 982, 985 (10th Cir. 2002)
- Vera v. Rodriguez, 2017 WL 6621048, at *1 (D.N.M. Dec. 27, 2017) (unpublished)
- Ysais v. Richardson, 603 F.3d 1175, 1180 (10th Cir. 2010)
- Servants of the Paraclete v. Does, 294 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2002)
- Bannister v. Davis, 590 U.S. 504, 508, 517 (2020)
- Holland v. Florida, 560 U.S. 631, 634, 645 (2010)
- Day v. McDonough, 547 U.S. 198, 205 (2006)
- Gibson v. Klinger, 232 F.3d 799, 804 (10th Cir. 2000)
- Mills v. Norris, 187 F.3d 881, 883 (8th Cir. 1999)
- Franklin v. Oklahoma, 2025 WL 869775, at *2 n.5 (10th Cir. Mar. 20, 2025) (unpublished)
- Proctor v. Whitten, 2021 WL 5755629, at *1 (10th Cir. Dec. 3, 2021) (unpublished)
- Jones v. Romero, 835 F. App'x 973, 976 (10th Cir. Nov. 25, 2020) (unpublished)
- Jimenez v. Quarterman, 555 U.S. 113, 114 (2009)
- Marler v. Langford, 2022 WL 2104232, at *5 (D. Kan. June 10, 2022) (unpublished)