

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

RODERICK KEITH DIRDEN,
Petitioner,
v.
STUART SHERMAN, Warden,
Respondent.

Case No. EDCV 15-2032-JLS (KK)

ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE

Pursuant to Title 28 of the United States Code, section 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, the records on file, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Court has engaged in *de novo* review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

In his objections to the Report, Petitioner also requests an evidentiary hearing. However, in habeas proceedings, “an evidentiary hearing is not required on issues that can be resolved by reference to the state court record.” *Totten v. Merkle*, 137 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 1998); *see also Earp v. Ornoski*, 431 F.3d 1158, 1173 (9th Cir. 2005). “It is axiomatic that when issues can be resolved with reference to the state court record, an evidentiary hearing becomes nothing more

1 than a futile exercise.” Totten, 137 F.3d at 1176. Here, the Magistrate Judge
2 concluded all of Petitioner’s claims could be resolved by reference to the state
3 court record. Accordingly, the Court denies Petitioner’s request for an evidentiary
4 hearing.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judgment be entered (1) denying the
6 Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus; and (2) dismissing this action with prejudice.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: July 6, 2016



HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON
United States District Judge