

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

Alree B. Sweat, III v. State of New Mexico

No. CIV 19-0987 JB/GJF · No. No. CIV 19-0987 JB/GJF; 2:19-cv-00987 · Decided January 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Mexico overruled Alree B. Sweat, III’s objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommended disposition in his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. The court adopted the recommended disposition, denied the petition with prejudice, and denied a certificate of appealability, concluding that Sweat’s speedy-trial claim was procedurally defaulted and that his Brady and ineffective-assistance claims lacked sufficient support.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
DECIDED	January 27, 2026
DOCKET	No. CIV 19-0987 JB/GJF; 2:19-cv-00987
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Federal habeas corpus proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The district court reviewed the petitioner's objections to the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommended disposition de novo under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and denied the petition with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducted de novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommended disposition to which specific objections were made, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) (3) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court applied the deferential standards governing § 2254 review, including whether the state-court decision involved an unreasonable application of federal law or an unreasonable determination of the facts, and the clear-and-convincing-evidence standard for rebutting state-court factual findings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum opinion and order from a federal district court, with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Alree B. Sweat, III v. State of New Mexico

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

ineffective assistance

speedy trial

due process

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

criminal procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Sweat overcame procedural default of his speedy-trial claim by showing cause and prejudice or that failure to consider the claim would result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice.
2. Whether the state court's rejection of Sweat's alleged Brady claim involved an unreasonable application of federal law or an unreasonable determination of fact.
3. Whether Sweat established that the state court unreasonably applied federal law or made an unreasonable factual determination in rejecting his ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claims.
4. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommended disposition and deny the § 2254 petition.

HOLDINGS

1. Sweat's speedy-trial claim could not support habeas relief because he did not show cause for failing to raise the claim in state court, actual prejudice, or that declining to consider the claim would result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice.
2. Sweat was not entitled to habeas relief on his claim that the State failed to disclose material exculpatory evidence because he did not demonstrate that the state-court decision involved an unreasonable application of federal law or an unreasonable determination of fact.
3. Sweat was not entitled to habeas relief on his ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claims because he failed to support the state court's factual determinations with clear and convincing evidence and failed to show an unreasonable application of federal law.
4. A federal district court may deny a § 2254 petition containing unexhausted claims on the merits when those claims can readily be resolved against the petitioner.
5. The court adopted the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommended disposition after conducting de novo review of the properly objected-to portions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” (Analysis)

“The Court denies Sweat’s Petition Under 28 U.S.C § 2254 for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.” (Analysis)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sweat was convicted in New Mexico state court and later sought federal habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He challenged his conviction based on an alleged speedy-trial violation, the State's alleged failure to disclose material exculpatory evidence, and ineffective assistance of counsel. The district court concluded that Sweat had not overcome procedural default on the speedy-trial claim, had not shown an unreasonable state-court determination on the alleged Brady violation, and had not supported his ineffective-assistance claims with the evidence required under § 2254.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sweat filed a § 2254 petition challenging his state conviction on speedy-trial, alleged Brady, and ineffective-assistance-of-counsel grounds. The magistrate judge issued proposed findings and a recommended disposition, and Sweat filed objections and additional objections. The district court overruled the objections, adopted the proposed findings and recommended disposition, denied the petition with prejudice, and denied a certificate of appealability.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 674-76 (1980)
- United States v. One Parcel of Real Property, With Buildings, Appurtenances, Improvements, and Contents, Known As: 2121 East 30th Street, Tulsa Okla., 73 F.3d 1057, 1059-61 (10th Cir. 1996)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147, 151 (1985)
- Niehaus v. Kansas Bar Ass'n, 793 F.2d 1159, 1165 (10th Cir. 1986)
- United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949 (6th Cir. 1981)
- Moore v. United States, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Marshall v. Chater, 75 F.3d 1421, 1426 (10th Cir. 1996)
- United States v. Garfinkle, 261 F.3d 1030, 1031 (10th Cir. 2001)
- Pevehouse v. Scibana, 229 F. App'x 795, 796 (10th Cir. 2007)
- United States v. Austin, 426 F.3d 1266, 1274 (10th Cir. 2005)
- In re Griego, 64 F.3d 580, 583-84 (10th Cir. 1995)
- Bratcher v. Bray-Doyle Indep. Sch. Dist. No. 42 of Stephens Cty., Okla., 8 F.3d 722, 724-25 (10th Cir. 1993)
- Workheiser v. City of Clovis, No. CIV 12-0485 JB/GBW, 2012 WL 6846401, at *3 (D.N.M. Dec. 28, 2012)
- Solomon v. Holder, No. CIV 12-1039 JB/LAM, 2013 WL 499300, at *4 (D.N.M. Jan. 31, 2013)
- O'Neill v. Jaramillo, No. CIV 11-0858 JB/GBW, 2013 WL 499521 (D.N.M. Jan. 31, 2013)
- Galloway v. JP Morgan Chase & Co., No. CIV 12-0625 JB/RHS, 2013 WL 503744 (D.N.M. Jan. 31, 2013)
- Fairchild v. Workman, 579 F.3d 1134, 1152-53, 1156 (10th Cir. 2009)
- Harris v. Lafler, 553 F.3d 1028, 1031 (6th Cir. 2009)
- Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 277-78 (2005)

- Granberry v. Greer, 481 U.S. 129, 134-35 (1987)
- Rudolph v. Galetka, 208 F.3d 227, *1 (10th Cir. 2000)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-new-mexico-united-states-district-court-for-the-dis/2026/alree-b-sweat-iii-v-state-of-new-mexico-tlxkf95c>