

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JOHN JAY MATECKI, III,

No. 2:18-cv-00461-YY

Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

BRIGITTE AMSBERRY,

Respondent.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge You issued a Findings and Recommendation on March 24, 2021, in which she recommends that this Court deny Petitioner’s Second Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [23]. F&R, ECF No. 66. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

Petitioner filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation. Pet'r's Obj., ECF No. 70. When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).


The Court has carefully considered Petitioner's objections and concludes that there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court adopts Magistrate Judge You's Findings and Recommendation No. 66. Therefore, Petitioner's Motion Second Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [23] is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 22, 2021.


MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ
United States District Judge