AHMIED v. LAUGHLIN Doc. 19

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA STATESBORO DIVISION

ELWALEED AHMED,

Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:18-cv-46

v.

VANCE LAUGHLIN,

Respondent.

## ORDER

The Court has conducted an independent and de novo review of the entire record and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, (doc. 17). Petitioner Elwaleed Ahmed ("Ahmed") filed Objections to this Report and Recommendation, (doc. 18).

The Magistrate Judge recommended the Court deny Ahmed's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Petition based on three grounds: 1) Ahmed did not show the state courts' adjudications on the sufficiency of evidence and the motion to suppress were contrary to or an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law, and thus, were not entitled to deference under § 2254(d); 2) Ahmed's invalid indictment claim was barred by Georgia's successive petition rule; and 3) Ahmed's ineffective assistance of counsel claim was defaulted under Georgia law. (Doc. 17, pp. 3–10.) Instead of objecting to the substance of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, Ahmed continues to challenge the state courts' determinations regarding his motion to suppress, which the trial court denied. (Doc. 18). Ahmed's Objections are in no way responsive to the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's Objections and **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation as the opinion of the Court. The Court **DENIES** Ahmed's § 2254 Petition, **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to **CLOSE** this case and enter the appropriate judgment of dismissal, and **DENIES** Ahmed *in forma pauperis* status on appeal and a Certificate of Appealability.

**SO ORDERED**, this 18th day of February, 2020.

R. STAN BAKER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA