

**NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION**

File Name: 16a0657n.06

**Case No. 16-5252**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**



MIGUEL SOTO, )  
 )  
 Petitioner-Appellant, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 RANDY WHITE, Warden )  
 )  
 Respondent-Appellee. )

ON APPEAL FROM THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
COURT FOR THE WESTERN  
DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

**OPINION**

**BEFORE: McKEAGUE, KETHLEDGE, and STRANCH Circuit Judges.**

**PER CURIAM.** Miguel Soto filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in which he asserts claims of juror bias and denial of the right to self-representation in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) provides relief to a habeas petitioner if the state-court decision was “contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal Law, as determined by the Supreme Court.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). If fair minded jurists could disagree as to the correctness of the state court’s decision, then Soto would not be entitled to relief. *Harrington v. Richter*, 562 U.S. 86, 102 (2011). The district court found that Soto failed to meet his burden of showing the Kentucky Supreme Court unreasonably applied federal law on both of his claims. R. 23, Dist. Ct. Op., PID 139, 141.

This court reviews the district court's legal conclusions de novo and any factual findings for clear error. *Magna v. Hofbauer*, 263 F.3d 542, 546 (6th Cir. 2001). Having duly considered the district court's opinion in light of Soto's appellate arguments, we find no error. His arguments are unavailing and are fairly and adequately addressed in the magistrate court's review and recommendation as fully adopted by the district court. To issue another opinion reiterating the analysis would be duplicative and unnecessary. Accordingly, we AFFIRM the district court's order denying Soto's habeas corpus petition on these two claims.