

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

CHARLES MICHAEL REYNOLDS,)	Case No. SACV 14-1972-JAK (JEM)
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND
v.)	RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED
)	STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
NEIL MCDOWELL,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636, the Court has reviewed the pleadings, the records on file, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Petitioner has filed Objections, and the Court has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which Petitioner has objected. To the extent that Petitioner attempts to introduce new evidence and raise new claims in his Objections, this Court declines to consider them. See Brown v. Roe, 279 F.3d 742, 744-45 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that a district court has discretion, but is not required, to consider evidence or claims presented for the first time in objections to a report and recommendation). Otherwise, Petitioner's Objections lack merit for the reasons stated in

1 the Report and Recommendation. The Court accepts the findings and recommendations of
2 the Magistrate Judge.¹

3 IT IS ORDERED that: (1) the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is denied; and (2)
4 Judgment shall be entered dismissing the action with prejudice.



5
6 DATED: 9/1/17

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

JOHN A. KRONSTADT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The Court notes two typographical errors on page one of the Report and Recommendation. The caption should read, "NEIL MCDOWELL, Respondent." The full sentence on page 1, line 26, should read, "On June 22, 2015, Respondent filed an Answer."