Doc. 14

in full;

In his objections, petitioner states that his claim is based on <u>Cunningham v.</u>

<u>California</u>, 127 S.Ct. 856 (2007), and that the Magistrate Judge erred by not referencing that case in the findings and recommendations. The holding in <u>Cunningham</u>, however, does not alter the Magistrate Judge's analysis or conclusion that petitioner's claims are plainly meritless because petitioner's upper term sentence was based on facts found by the jury.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations filed December 29, 2008, are adopted
  - 2. This action is summarily dismissed; and
- 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment of dismissal and close this file.

DATED: January 23, 2009.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE