

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**

Michael J. Cohn,

Petitioner,

v.

Arizona, State of,

Respondent.

No. CV-15-00267-PHX-DLR

**ORDER**

Pending before this Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Eileen S. Willett, (Doc. 53), regarding petitioner’s Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, (Doc. 10). The R&R recommends that the Petition be denied and dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R. (Doc. 53 at 11 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72).) Petitioner filed objections on February 25, 2016. (Doc. 55.)

The Court has considered the objections and reviewed the R&R de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objections are made). The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s determinations, accepts the recommended decision within the meaning of Rule 72(b), and overrules Petitioner’s objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”).

