

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Steve Wooden v. Superintendent Joseph Terra, Philadelphia County
District Attorney's Office

Wooden · No. 2:23-cv-1366 · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania denied and dismissed Steve Wooden’s motion for relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). The court also denied a certificate of appealability to the extent the motion could be construed as a successive petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-1366
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved for relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). The court denied and dismissed the motion. To the extent the motion was construed as a successive habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244, the court denied a certificate of appealability.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For a certificate of appealability, the court applied the substantial-showing and reasonable-jurist standards stated in Slack v. McDaniel.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- successive petitions
- post-conviction relief
- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner was entitled to relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b).
2. Whether, if the motion were construed as a successive habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244, Petitioner was entitled to a certificate of appealability.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment under Rule 60(b) was denied and dismissed.
2. A certificate of appealability was denied because Petitioner had not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right and reasonable jurists would not find the court's assessment debatable or wrong.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Petitioner’s Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), ECF No. 23, is DENIED and DISMISSED.” (p. 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The supplied text contains no substantive facts about the underlying criminal conviction or habeas proceedings. It establishes only that Steve Wooden sought relief from judgment under Rule 60(b) in this federal habeas matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The supplied order addresses Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), ECF No. 23. The court denied and dismissed the motion for the reasons stated in an opinion issued the same day. The order further stated that, if construed as a successive petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244, a certificate of appealability was denied.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA STEVE WOODEN,; Petitioner,;; Case No. 2:23-cv-1366 v.: SUPERINTENDENT JOSEPH TERRA,; PHILADELPHIA COUNTY DISTRICT: ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,; Respondents.: O R D E R AND NOW, this 3rd day of December, 2025, for the reasons set forth in the Opinion issued this

date, IT IS ORDERED THAT: Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), ECF No. 23, is DENIED and DISMISSED.¹ BY THE COURT: /s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr. _____ JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR. United States District Judge 1 To the extent the motion could be construed as a successive petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2244, a certificate of appealability is denied because Wooden has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, nor would jurists of reason find the Court's assessment debatable or wrong.

See *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). 1