1	
2	0
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	WESTERN DIVISION
11	
12	RAY RONNIE GOVEA,) No. CV 11-03396-CAS (VBK)
13) Petitioner,) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND) RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES
14	v.) MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15	ROBERT TRIMBLE,
16	Respondent.)
17)
18	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the Third
19	Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Third Amended Petition"),
20	the records and files herein, and the Report and Recommendation of the
21	United States Magistrate Judge ("Report"). Further, the Court has
22	engaged in <u>de</u> <u>novo</u> review of those portions of the Report to which
23	Petitioner has objected.
24	//
25	//
26	//
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	Christing a. Snyde
5	DATED: <u>November 4, 2014</u> CHRISTINA A. SNYDER
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7	
8	
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 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a
22	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 different manner or that the issues presented were `adequate to
25	deserve encouragement to proceed further'." <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u> , 529 U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks
26	omitted); <u>see also Miller-El v. Cockrell</u> , 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct. 1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this
27	Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the issuance of a COA.
28	ISSUALLEE OF A COA.