

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Stephen M. Nardi,

Petitioner,

vs.

Dora B. Schriro, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV 01-1185-PHX-EHC (LOA)

ORDER

Before the Court is an Amended Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 79) from Magistrate Judge Anderson, which recommends denial of Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Dkt. 1) and the claims asserted in his 2004 Memorandum (Dkt. 25). Petitioner filed Objections to the Amended Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 86). Respondents filed a Response to Petitioner’s Objections (Dkt. 89).

The Court reviews *de novo* the portions of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which Petitioner has filed an objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)(“a judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report, ..., to which objection is made.”); see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). The district court is not required to review any issue that is not the subject of an objection. Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219 (D. Ariz. 2003), citing Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

The Court having reviewed the record, including Objections filed by Petitioner and

1 Response by Respondents, adopts in full the Amended Report and Recommendations of the
2 Magistrate Judge and incorporates the same as a part of this Order.


3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS ORDERED** adopting the Amended Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 79).

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas
6 Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Dkt. 1) and the claims asserted in the 2004
7 Memorandum (Dkt. 25) are **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

8 DATED this 30th day of September, 2008.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Earl H. Carroll
United States District Judge