

O

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GERALD A. TAJA JR.,
Petitioner,
v.
C. E. DUCART, Warden,
Respondent.

Case No. ED CV 14-1069 FMO (JCG)

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND
DENYING CERTIFICATE OF
APPEALABILITY AND
EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, Petitioner’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation, and the remaining record, and has made a *de novo* determination.

Petitioner’s Objections generally reiterate the arguments made in the Petition and Traverse, and lack merit for the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Report and Recommendation is approved and accepted;
2. Judgment be entered denying the Petition and dismissing this action with prejudice; and
3. The Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

Additionally, for the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, the

1 Court finds that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a
2 constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); *Miller-El v.*
3 *Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003). Thus, the Court declines to issue a certificate of
4 appealability.

5 Nor is Petitioner entitled to an evidentiary hearing. *See Cullen v. Pinholster*,
6 131 S. Ct. 1388, 1398 (2011) (AEDPA “requires an examination of the state court-
7 decision at the time it was made. It follows that the record under review is limited to
8 the record in existence at that same time *i.e.*, the record before the state court.”).

9
10 DATED: January 12, 2015

11 _____/s/_____
12

13 HON. FERNANDO M. OLGUIN
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28