

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

GEORGE DOUGLAS SANDERS,
Petitioner,

Civil No. 06-1560-AC

v.

ORDER

BRIAN BELLEQUE

Respondent.

MARSH, Judge.

Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta filed his Findings and Recommendation on December 30, 2008. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's


Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Petitioner has filed timely objections. I have, therefore, given the file of this case a *de novo* review.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Findings and Recommendation #39 of Magistrate Judge Acosta. The First Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (#32) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 22 day of January, 2009.



Malcolm F. Marsh
United States District Judge