The gravamen of plaintiff's complaint is that he was denied his First Amendment right of access to the courts. He alleges that while he was able to file a petition for rehearing en banc pursuant

26

27

28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27 28 to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 35, he was unable to file a petition for a panel rehearing pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 40, he was unable to file a writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, and he was unable to petition in "State/Federal District Court to show 'actual innocence'" after the alleged destruction of his legal files. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted because the plaintiff was unable to show actual injury. The report and recommendation states that plaintiff does not have a constitutional right of access to the courts to appeal the denial of his habeas petition, the Ninth Circuit did not grant plaintiff leave to file a second habeas petition, and the plaintiff has failed to allege an actual injury required to state an access to courts claim.

The court has considered the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record and has made a review and determination in accordance with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 636 and applicable case law, and good cause appearing, the court hereby ADOPTS AND ACCEPTS the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (#29). Accordingly, the defendants' motion to dismiss (#11) is GRANTED.

DATED: This 15th day of June, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard DMEKiller