

/////

On March 2, 2012, petitioner filed objections to the December 28, 2011 findings and recommendations and a document entitled "Motion for Acceptance of late filing of Objections." In the motion, petitioner explains that he mailed his objections to this court in a timely manner but the post office damaged the document and sent it back to him on approximately February 29, 2012. Petitioner states that he immediately mailed the objections back to this court.¹

On March 14, 2012, petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration of this court's March 1, 2012 order. Therein, petitioner explains that his objections to the December 28, 2011 findings and recommendations were filed late "through no fault of his own." He requests that the March 1, 2012 order be "reversed" and that this court consider his objections to the findings and recommendations. On May 29, 2012, petitioner filed another motion for reconsideration of the March 1, 2012 order.

This court has now considered petitioner's March 2, 2012 objections to the December 28, 2011 findings and recommendations and, in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, 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 March 1, 2012 order issued by this court (Dckt. No. 82) is vacated;
- 2. Petitioner's March 14, 2012 motion for reconsideration (Dckt. No. 91) is denied as unnecessary;
- 3. Petitioner's May 29, 2012 motion for reconsideration (Dckt. No. 103) is denied as unnecessary;

¹ Also on March 2, 2012, petitioner filed a notice of appeal of the March 1, 2012 order. On May 10, 2012, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit dismissed that appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

1	4. Petitioner's March 2, 2012 motion for acceptance of late filing of objections
2	(Dckt. No. 83) is granted;
3	5. The findings and recommendations filed December 28, 2011, are adopted in
4	full;
5	6. Petitioner's March 21, 2011 motion to amend (Doc. No. 53) is denied;
6	7. Petitioner's June 29, 2011 motion to amend (Doc. No. 70) is denied; and
7	8. For the reasons set forth in the December 28, 2011 findings and
8	recommendations, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.
9	Dated: June 13, 2012
10	$A_{0} = D_{0}$
11	GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
12	United States District Judge
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
- 11	