1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
9	GARY MICHAEL GALLION,)Case No. EDCV 16-1992-RSWL (JPR)								
10	Petitioner,)								
11	v.) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND) RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.								
12	MAGISTRATE JUDGE MICHAEL SEXTON, Warden, ¹)								
13	Respondent.								
14									
15	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \S 636, the Court has reviewed the								
16	Petition, records on file, and Report and Recommendation of U.S.								
17	Magistrate Judge. On December 29, 2017, Petitioner filed								
18	objections to the R. & R., in which he mostly simply repeats								
19	arguments from his Petition and Traverse. A few of his								
20	contentions warrant brief discussion, however.								
21	The Magistrate Judge did not "misconstrue" Petitioner's								
22	void-for-vagueness argument (<u>see</u> Objs. at 2); she discussed at								
23	length why the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Kolender v. Lawson</u> ,								
24	461 U.S. 352, 357 (1983), could not provide Petitioner any relief								
25	(see R. & R. at 17-21), and she explained that a federal habeas								
26									
27	¹ Michael Sexton, warden of the California State Prison at								

Corcoran, where Petitioner is housed (see Notice of Change of Address at 1), is substituted in under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d) as the sole respondent. See R. 2, Rs. Governing § 2254 Cases in U.S. Dist. Cts.

1 court is bound by a state court's interpretation of its own law 2 (see id. at 17), and thus his Andreasen² argument must fail 3 (see Objs. at 3-4).

4 Petitioner continues not to explain how he was prejudiced by 5 any ineffective assistance of counsel: for instance, he still 6 does not name the witnesses his counsel allegedly should have 7 called (see Objs. at 5-6) despite the Magistrate Judge's noting 8 that that failure was fatal to his claim (see R. & R. at 25). 9 And he does not offer any evidence - or, more importantly, point 10 to any such evidence already in the record - demonstrating that 11 any member of the jury was exposed to potentially inflammatory 12 trial coverage in the media. (See Objs. at 7-8.)

13 Having made a de novo review of all portions of the R. & R. 14 to which Petitioner objected, the Court accepts the findings and 15 recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

16 IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that the Petition is denied and Judgment be entered dismissing this action with prejudice.

17

18

19	DATED:	1/24/2018	S	<u>/ RON/</u>	ALD S.	W. LE	W			
20				-	S.W. ISTRI		UDGE			
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28	2 2013).	People v. Andreasen	, 214	Cal.	App.	4th	70,	79	(Ct.	App