

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**

<b>ALEX JENNINGS III,</b>	)	<b>NO. EDCV 15-1185-GW(KS)</b>
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	<b>ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND</b>
	)	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE</b>
	)	
<b>K. STANORO, Warden,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	
	)	


---

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Petition”), all of the records herein, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (“Report”), and Petitioner’s Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Objections”). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report to which objections have been stated. Having completed its review, the Court accepts the findings and recommendations set forth in the Report.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that: (1) the Petition is DENIED; and (2) Judgment shall be entered dismissing this action with prejudice.

1 Further, to the extent Petitioner requests a stay in the Objections, that request is denied  
2 because Petitioner's unexhausted claims are plainly meritless and are denied as such  
3 following a *de novo* review. *Cf. Dixon v. Baker*, 847 F.3d 714, 720 (9th Cir. 2017) (a stay and  
4 abeyance is appropriate when, *inter alia*, the petitioner's claims "are not plainly meritless").

5  
6 DATED: March 27, 2017



---

7 GEORGE H. WU  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28