<pre>2 3 4 5 6 7 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 7 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 JASON ROMO, NO. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 14 15 15 15 15 16 17 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 16 17 17 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</pre>	1	
4 5 6 7 8 0 9 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 17 17 18 19 19 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 <t< td=""><td>2</td><td></td></t<>	2	
S G 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 WESTERN DIVISION 10 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VBK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER, J 15 Respondent. J 16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 17 Fursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 10 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 11 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 12 // 14 // 15 // 16 J 17 It is prevented by the petition of the United States Magistrate 17 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 16 J// 17 J/	3	
6 7 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 WESTERN DIVISION 10 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER, MAGISTRATE JUDGE 15 Respondent.) 16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 10 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 11 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 12 // 13 // 14 // 15 // 16 // 17 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 16 // 17 // 16 //	4	
7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 WESTERN DIVISION 10 JASON ROMO, NO. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER,) 15 Respondent.) 16 . . 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 12 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in de novo review of 12 // 13 . 14 . 15 . 16 . 17 Fursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in de novo review of 12 // 12 . 13 .	5	
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 WESTERN DIVISION 10 No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 11 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER, MAGISTRATE JUDGE 15 Respondent. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 10 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in de novo review of 12 // 13 // 14 // 15 // 16 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in de novo review of 17 // 18 // 19 // 19 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in de novo review of 10 // // </td <td>6</td> <td></td>	6	
9 WESTERN DIVISION 10 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER,) 15 Respondent.) 16	7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 11 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER, MAGISTRATE JUDGE 15 Respondent. Magistrate 16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 20 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 21 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 // 28 // 29 // 20 // 21 // 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // <td>8</td> <td>CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA</td>	8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 JASON ROMO, No. CV 12-01677-AG (VEK) 12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER, MAGISTRATE JUDGE 15 Respondent. Magistrate 16	9	WESTERN DIVISION
12 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER,) 15 Respondent.) 16)) 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 20 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 21 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	10	
13 v.) RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES 14 M. D. BITER,) 15	11	JASON ROMO,) No. CV 12-01677-AG (VBK)
13 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 M. D. BITER,) 15 Respondent.) 16 . . 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition 18 for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, 19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 20 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 21 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	12	
15Respondent.1617Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition18for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein,19and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate20Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of21those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected.22//23//24//25//26//27//	13	
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. // // // // // //	14	M. D. BITER,
17Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition18for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein,19and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate20Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of21those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected.22//23//24//25//26//27//	15	Respondent.)
for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. // // // // // // //	16	
19 and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate 20 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of 21 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	17	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Petition
20 Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de novo</u> review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	18	for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), the records and files herein,
<pre>21 those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //</pre>	19	and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate
22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	20	Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has engaged in <u>de</u> <u>novo</u> review of
23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	21	those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected.
24 // 25 // 26 // 27 //	22	//
25 // 26 // 27 //	23	//
26 // 27 //	24	//
27 //	25	//
	26	//
28 //	27	//
	28	//

1	IT IS ORDERED that: (1) the Court accepts the findings and
2	recommendations of the Magistrate Judge, and (2) the Court declines to
3	issue a Certificate of Appealability ("COA"). 1
4	
5	C.A.C.
6	Cong S
7	DATED: June 30, 2013
8	ANDREW J. GUILFORD UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	¹ Under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2), a COA may issue "only if the
22	applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a
23	Certificate of Appealability under §2253(c), a habeas petitioner must show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that
24	matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a
24 25	different manner or that the issues presented were `adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further'." <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u> , 529
25 26	U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks omitted); <u>see also Miller-El v. Cockrell</u> , 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct.
∠6 27	1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of
27	the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the issuance of a COA.