

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION

TRAVIS LEROY BALL,	:	
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No. 5:23-CR-55-CAR-CHW-1
	:	Case No. 5:25-CV-262-CAR-CHW
	:	
	:	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	Proceeding Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255
	:	
Respondent.	:	
_____	:	

ORDER ON RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before the Court is the United States Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation to grant the Government’s Motion to Dismiss Petitioner Travis Leroy Ball’s Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Petitioner filed a “Motion to Oppose United States Motion to Dismiss¹ Movants § 2255 Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence” which the Court **CONSTRUES** as an Objection to the Recommendation [Doc. 49]. In his Objection, Petitioner restates arguments and contentions that have been thoroughly and completely addressed in the Order and

¹ The United States has filed no motion to dismiss in this action.

Recommendation. This Court has fully considered the record in this case and made a *de novo* determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which Petitioner objects.

Having done so, the Court finds Petitioner's Objection unpersuasive. Having considered the Order and Recommendation, the Court agrees with the findings and conclusions of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Order and Recommendation [Doc. 54] is hereby **ADOPTED** and **MADE THE ORDER OF THE COURT**. As set forth in the Order and Recommendation, because (1) Petitioner failed to show ineffective assistance of counsel; (2) Petitioner's claims in Grounds Two, Three, and Four are subject to procedural default and barred by the valid collateral attack waiver in Petitioner's plea agreement; (3) Petitioner's claims of malicious prosecution are not cognizable under Section 2255; and (4) Petitioner's allegations of constitutional violations are meritless, the Court **DENIES** his § 2255 Motion to Vacate [Doc. 45] and **DISMISSES AS MOOT** his Motions for the Court to issue its Report and Recommendation [Docs. 51 and 53]. Additionally, because Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 23rd day of April, 2026.

S/ C. Ashley Royal
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT