1 0

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

```
GEOVANY VELASQUEZ,

Petitioner,

ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND

V.

PECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

CORRS.,

Respondent.

Case No. CV 15-5881-R (JPR)

NAME OF THE CAL DEP'T OF SECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.

NAME OF THE CAL DEP'T OF SECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.

NAME OF THE CAL DEP'T OF SECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.

NAME OF THE CAL DEP'T OF SECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.

NAME OF THE CAL DEP'T OF SECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.
```

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition, records on file, and Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge. On January 30, 2017, Petitioner filed objections to the R. & R., stating that he had not been able to visit the law library but was filing his objections so as not to miss the deadline for doing so. But shortly before the Court received the objections it had granted Petitioner's request for an extension, giving him until March 20 to file objections. Petitioner has not filed any additional objections within that time, although he did lodge with the Court a copy of his Comprehensive Risk Assessment for the Board of Parole Hearings, which the Court has read and considered.

As the Magistrate Judge explained in the R. & R., Petitioner's habeas claims are foreclosed by the Ninth Circuit's recent en banc decision in <u>Nettles v. Grounds</u>, 830 F.3d 922 (9th

Cir. 2016) (en banc), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 645 (2017). Nothing in Petitioner's objections or the risk assessment changes the fact that under Nettles, his claims sound, if at all, in civil rights, not habeas. For the reasons stated in the R. & R. the Court declines to construe the Petition as a civil-rights lawsuit, but nothing prevents Petitioner from filing a new lawsuit, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, raising his claims. The Clerk is directed to provide Petitioner with a copy of the Court's pro se civil-rights complaint packet.

Having reviewed de novo those portions of the R. & R. to which objections were filed, the Court accepts the findings and IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. that the Petition is denied and Judgment be entered dismissing this action.

DATED: <u>March 24, 2017</u>

REAL

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE