IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN JONES,	)	CASE NO.: 5:14 CV 1231
	)	
Petitioner,	)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
	)	
v.	)	ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE'S
	)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
ALAN LAZAROFF, WARDEN,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

This matter comes before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Vernelis K. Armstrong (ECF #15). The Report and Recommendation, issued on January 21, 2015, is hereby ADOPTED by this Court. Petitioner John Jones filed this action seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner timely filed objections to Magistrate Judge Armstrong's Report and Recommendation on February 4, 2015 (ECF #16).

This Court has since reviewed Magistrate Judge Armstrong's Report and Recommendation *de novo*, and finds it to be thorough, well-written, and correct. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). This Court also finds that Petitioner Jones's objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report – while extensive – raise no arguments, either factual or legal, that have not already been comprehensively and competently addressed by the Magistrate Judge. Without exception, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's treatment of Petitioner's arguments to be correct and fair, and therefore adopts the Report in its entirety, over Petitioner's objections.

Magistrate Judge Armstrong recommended in her well-reasoned Report that Jones' Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus be denied. Grounds One, Two, and Four are procedurally defaulted; federal habeas review is precluded on those grounds. The Magistrate Judge

considered the merits of Ground Three and Ground Five, and upon review recommended that the claims be denied. This Court finds no reason to disagree with Magistrate Judge Armstrong's recommendation. Therefore, the Report and Recommendation (ECF #15) is ADOPTED by this Court *in toto*; and John Jones' Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF #1) is DENIED.

Further, for the reasons stated in this Order and in the Magistrate Judge's Report, a reasonable jurist could not conclude that dismissal of the Petition is in error or that Petitioner should be permitted to proceed further. Accordingly, this Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); FED. R. APP. P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Donald C. Nugent

DONALD C. NUGENT
United States District Judge

DATED: March 31, 2015