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

CONSTANTINO VEJAR SANCHEZ,) Case No. CV 14-4730-JAK (JPR)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Petitioner,) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S. vs. MAGISTRATE JUDGE STU SHERMAN, Warden, Respondent.

The Court has reviewed the Petition, records on file, and Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636. On September 18, 2015, Petitioner filed objections to the R&R, in which he mostly repeats arguments from the Petition and Reply.

As he did in his Reply (see Reply at 6-8), Petitioner alleges that his victim hit him with a metal staple gun and put five staples in his head (Objections at 1-2). He states that although "there's no mention of that in the record," he presented the staple-gun allegation to the state courts on habeas review in the form of a medical report. (Id. at 1.) But no such document exists among the exhibits attached to his state-supreme-court

habeas petition, and Petitioner does not allege anything about a staple gun on that petition's form. (See generally Pet., Ex. A at 32-56.)¹ Further, as the Magistrate Judge noted (R&R at 25), although Petitioner testified in his defense at trial, he never mentioned a staple gun.

Having reviewed de novo those portions of the R&R to which objections were filed, the Court accepts the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. IT IS ORDERED that the Petition is denied, Petitioner's request for a copy of the videotape is denied, and Judgment be entered dismissing this action with prejudice.

DATED: 10/9/15

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

KRONSTADT

¹ Further, none of the exhibits presented to the state supreme court were missing in the copy of the petition submitted to this Court. Petitioner refers to exhibits A1, A2, B1, B2, and C on the supreme-court habeas petition's form (see Pet., Ex. A at 34), and all five exhibits follow the last page of the petition (id. at 37-55).