1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DOUGLAS DWAYNE GIRLEY, No. 2:12-cv-1938 KJM KJN P 12 Petitioner. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 GARY SWARTHOUT, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this application for a writ of habeas 18 corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as 19 provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On October 11, 2013, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which 21 were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the 22 findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. Petitioner has filed 23 objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this 25 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the court 26 finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis. 27 ///// 28 //// 1

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The findings and recommendations filed October 11, 2013 (ECF No. 33), are adopted in full; 2. Petitioner's motion for stay and to amend (ECF No. 31) is denied; 3. Petitioner is granted thirty days in which to file a reply to respondent's answer; and 4. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C. § 2253. Petitioner may not appeal the denial of a motion to stay and to amend because it is an interlocutory order, not a final judgment. DATED: February 28, 2014.