



1 court is bound by a state court's interpretation of its own law  
2 (see id. at 17), and thus his Andreasen<sup>2</sup> 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  
17 Judgment be entered dismissing this action with prejudice.

18  
19 DATED: 1/24/2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/ RONALD S.W. LEW  
RONALD S.W. LEW  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>2</sup> People v. Andreasen, 214 Cal. App. 4th 70, 79 (Ct. App.  
2013).