IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

AUGUSTIN GALVIN-GARCIA, JR.,

Petitioner,

CASE NO. 2:12-CV-261 CRIM. NO. 2:10-CR-225(3) JUDGE MARBLEY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KING

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

OPINION AND ORDER

On June 3, 2013, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court hold an evidentiary hearing on Petitioner's claim that he was denied the effective assistance of counsel because his attorney failed to file an appeal after being requested to do so and failed to consult with Petitioner regarding the filing of an appeal. *Report and Recommendation*, Doc. No. 184. The Magistrate Judge further recommended that the remainder of Petitioner's claims be dismissed. Petitioner has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Report and Recommendation*. *Objection*, Doc. No. 188.

Petitioner objects to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that certain claims be dismissed; he contends that the Court should conduct an evidentiary hearing on these claims.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review. For the reasons already detailed in the Magistrate Judge's *Report and Recommendation*, Petitioner's *Objection*, Doc. No. 188, is **OVERRULED**. The *Report and Recommendation*, Doc. No. 184, is **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**. Counsel shall be appointed to represent Petitioner at an evidentiary hearing before the Magistrate Judge on Petitioner's claim that he was denied effective assistance of counsel because his attorney failed to file an appeal

1

after being requested to do so and failed to consult with Petitioner regarding the filing of an appeal. The remainder of Petitioner's claims are hereby **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ALGENON L. MAR 31-E-Y

United States District Judge