

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
WASHINGTON**

**William B. Rowan v. Jefferey Perkins**

Rowan · No. 1:25-CV-03158-TOR · Decided January 6, 2026

---

**SUMMARY**

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington dismissed William B. Rowan's pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 with prejudice. The court found that Rowan failed to amend the petition as directed and that his claims concerning the constitutionality of Washington's non-corroboration statute were not cognizable habeas claims; it also denied a certificate of appealability.

**OPINION**

1 Jan 06, 2026 SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 5 6 WILLIAM B. ROWAN, NO: 1:25-CV-03158-  
TOR 7 Petitioner, ORDER DISMISSING ACTION 8 v. 9 JEFFEREY PERKINS, 10 Respondent.  
11 12 By Order filed October 21, 2025, the Court advised Petitioner of the 13 deficiencies of his  
pro se Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State 14 Custody pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
2254 and directed him to amend within sixty days.

15 ECF No. 5. Petitioner, an individual incarcerated at the Coyote Ridge Corrections 16 Center,  
has paid the \$5.00 filing fee. Respondent has not been served. 17 Petitioner did not comply with  
the Court's instructions and has filed nothing 18 further in this action.

The Court noted that all of Petitioner's asserted grounds for 19 relief involved a challenge to the  
constitutionality of RCW 9A.44.020(1), a state 20 non-corroboration statute. Petitioner's claim that  
this statute is unconstitutional is not 1 || a cognizable habeas claim. See *Smith v. Ryan*, 823 F.3d  
1270, 1282 (9th Cir. 2016) 2|| (quoting *Rhoades v. Henry*, 611 F.3d 1133, 1142 (9th Cir.

2010)); see also *Peltier v. Wright*, 15 F.3d 860, 861-62 (9th Cir. 1994) (noting that generally  
federal habeas 4|| corpus is unavailable for alleged errors in interpretation and application of state  
law). 5|| Further, Petitioner failed to demonstrate that his federal habeas corpus petition was 6||  
timely or that each claim was properly exhausted. ECF No. 5 at 3-7.

7 The Court cautioned Petitioner that his failure to amend within 60 days as 8 || directed would  
result in the dismissal of the petition. Accordingly, for the reasons 9|| set forth above and in the  
Order to Amend Petition, IT IS ORDERED: 10 1. This action is DISMISSED with prejudice  
pursuant to Rule 4, Rules 11 Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.

12 2. The Court certifies that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), an appeal from 13 this decision could not be taken in good faith, and there is no basis upon 14 which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. 15 App. P. 22(b). A certificate of appealability is DENIED. 16 The Clerk of Court shall enter this Order, enter judgment, provide copies to 17|| Petitioner, and CLOSE the file.

18 DATED January 6, 2026. 20 nay ui is = HOMAS O. RICE rns United States District Judge