

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MICHAEL D. HICKMAN,

 Petitioner,

 v.

ANTHONY HEDGEPEETH, Warden,

 Respondent.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00547-LJO-SKO-HC

ORDER RE: FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS (DOC. 40)

ORDER DISMISSING PETITIONER'S
MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
(DOC. 37)

ORDEER DISREGARDING IN PART
PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL TRAVERSE
AND PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL
MOTION FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING
(DOCS. 32, 39)

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rules 302 through 304.

On July 31, 2014, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations that Petitioner's supplemental traverse and supplemental motion for evidentiary hearing be disregarded in part and Petitioner's motion for injunctive relief be dismissed. The findings and recommendations were served on all parties on the same date. The findings and recommendations advised the parties that

1 objections could be filed within thirty days and replies within
2 fourteen days after the filing of objections. On August 7, 2014,
3 Petitioner filed objections. Although over fourteen days have
4 passed since the filing of objections, no reply to the objections
5 has been filed.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C),
7 this Court has conducted a de novo review of the case. The
8 undersigned has carefully reviewed the entire file and has
9 considered the objections; the undersigned has determined there is
10 no need to modify the findings and recommendations based on the
11 points raised in the objections. Petitioner's generalized
12 assertions do not demonstrate that he would be entitled to relief
13 from his delay and failure to exhaust state court remedies. The
14 Court finds that the report and recommendations are supported by the
15 record and proper analysis.

16 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations filed on July 31, 2014,
18 are ADOPTED in full; and
19 2. Petitioner's motion for injunctive relief is DISMISSED; and
20 3. Petitioner's supplemental traverse and supplemental motion
21 for evidentiary hearing are DISREGARDED insofar as they raise
22 sentencing claims.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: August 27, 2014

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28