

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
78 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 ROBIE HULL,

CV F 06-00715 LJO DLB HC

11 v. Petitioner,

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDING; DENYING PETITION
FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS;
DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER
JUDGMENT; AND DECLINING TO ISSUE
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

12 JULIE WARD, Warden,

13 Respondent.

14 [Doc. 18]
1516 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus
17 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.18 On December 4, 2007, the Magistrate Judge issued Findings and Recommendation that
19 the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus be DENIED. This Findings and Recommendation was
20 served on all parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30)
21 days of the date of service of the order. Over thirty (30) days have passed and no party has filed
22 objections.23 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted
24 a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the
25 Findings and Recommendation is supported by the record and proper analysis.

26 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

27 1. The Findings and Recommendation issued December 4, 2007, is ADOPTED IN
28 FULL;

2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DENIED;
3. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to enter judgment for Respondent; and,
4. The court declines to issue a Certificate of Appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c);
Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (a COA should be granted where the applicant has made “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right,” i.e., when “reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong”; Hoffman v. Arave, 455 F.3d 926, 943 (9th Cir. 2006) (same). In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find it debatable that the state courts’ decision denying Petitioner’s petition for writ of habeas corpus were not “objectively unreasonable.”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 3, 2008

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE