

specific findings that the party disagrees with.” *United States v. Schultz*, 565 F.3d 1353, 1360 (11th Cir. 2009) (alteration added).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and the Petitioner’s objections. The Petitioner objects to the dismissal of his petition without any specificity and without stating the bases for his objections. He offers only his conclusory assertions the Magistrate Judge erred but he does not point to any legal error committed by the Magistrate Judge. *See* Doc. 22. The Recommendation is reviewed for clear error, and the Court finds that the Petitioner’s objections are due to be overruled.

Moreover, the Petitioner requested in his objections and he filed a motion for an evidentiary hearing, (doc. 23). “An evidentiary hearing may be necessary where the material facts are in dispute, but a petitioner is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing when his claims are merely conclusory allegations unsupported by specifics.” *San Martin v. McNeil*, 633 F.3d 1257, 1271 (11th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Pugh v. Smith*, 465 F.3d 1295, 1300 (11th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks, citation, and alterations omitted)). Thus, the Court concludes that under the circumstances of this case, an evidentiary hearing is unnecessary.

Accordingly, for the reasons as stated and for good cause, it is

ORDERED as follows:

1. the Petitioner’s objections (doc. 22) are OVERRULED;
2. the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 21) is ADOPTED;
3. the Petitioner’s motion for an evidentiary hearing (doc. 23) is DENIED; and
4. this case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

A final judgment will be entered.

DONE this 14th day of September, 2021.

/s/ Emily C. Marks
EMILY C. MARKS
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE