1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	CARLOS DAGOBERTO RIVAS,) Case No. SACV 16-0307-JVS (JPR)
11	Petitioner,)) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND
12	v.) RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.) MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	SHAWN HATTON, Warden,))
14	Respondent.)
15	
16	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the
17	Petition, all the records and files of this case, and the Report
18	and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge.
19	On December 12, 2016, Petitioner filed objections to the
20	R. & R., in which for the most part he simply repeats arguments

21 in the Petition and Traverse. Only two objections warrant discussion. First, he repeats his claim that translation "discrepancies" in his interview transcripts rendered the state courts' denial of his Miranda claim "flawed and erroneously reached." (Objs. at 5-6; see also Pet., Attach. Mem. at 18 n.3 (noting same transcript discrepancies).) Second, as to his

consular-notification claim, Petitioner cites out-of-circuit authority purportedly demonstrating that some federal courts have

1 held that Article 36 of the Vienna Convention confers 2 individually enforceable rights. (Objs. at 8-9.)

Both objections lack merit. The fact that the prosecution 3 4 used English translations of Petitioner's interview transcripts 5 at the Miranda hearing that were slightly different from those given to the jury at his trial two days later was well noted and 6 7 explored by defense counsel. (<u>See, e.q.</u>, Lodged Doc. 3 at 33-41 8 & n.23 (citing both translations in detail but conceding that 9 they were "identical in content" except for minor stylistic 10 differences); Lodged Doc. 10 at 4 n.3 (noting same issue in 11 petition for review, that "[t]he two sets of transcripts are not 12 identical").) In his appellate brief, Petitioner expressly 13 acknowledged that the different versions were essentially "identical in content": 14

Court Exhibit 2, which appears in the record (2 CT 349-397), is identical in content (with a slight pagination difference) to People's Exhibit 6A (2 CT 254-302), which was admitted into evidence at trial . . . Court Exhibit 3, which also appears in the record (2 CT 398-443), is identical in content (with a different footer) to People's Exhibit 6B (2 CT 303-348), which was admitted into evidence at trial . . . ¹

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

(See Lodged Doc. 3 at 33 n.23 (some record citations omitted).)

¹ As Petitioner correctly noted, the transcripts admitted at the pretrial <u>Miranda</u> hearing were marked as court exhibits 2 and 3, and the transcripts given to the jury at trial were marked as People's exhibits 6A and 6B. (<u>See</u> Objs. at 5.)

1 In any event, as the R. & R. makes clear, "[b]ecause Miranda 2 involves a totality-of-circumstances inquiry," whether Petitioner 3 knowingly and voluntarily waived his Miranda rights does not 4 depend on any specific words or utterances in isolation (see R. & 5 R. at 11, 27-30) - including, for example, whether he said "Uhhuh, yes, if [indecipherable] I can't say anything?" or "Uh-huh, 6 7 yes, if [indecipherable] now I can't tell you anything?" in 8 confirming his understanding of his right to remain silent (see 9 Objs. at 5-6). (<u>See also</u> R. & R. at 30 (finding no law requiring 10 suspect to "affirmatively indicate after each of the four 11 warnings his understanding of it").)

12 Further, the Magistrate Judge did not say that no court has 13 ever held that Article 36 of the Vienna Convention confers 14 individual rights; rather, she correctly noted that "the Supreme 15 Court has never clearly established that the Vienna Convention 16 creates judicially enforceable private rights," citing, among 17 others, various Supreme Court cases in support. (See R. & R. at 18 33-34.) Thus, because federal habeas review looks only to 19 clearly established Supreme Court decisions for guidance, 20 Petitioner's second objection has no merit.

Accordingly, having made a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made, the Court concurs with and accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that the Petition be denied. IT THEREFORE

28

IS ORDERED that Judgment be entered denying the Petition and dismissing this action with prejudice.

DATED: January 9, 2017

JAMES V. SELŃA U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE