

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EARL R. HASSAN,	:	
<i>Petitioner,</i>	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	NO. 15-0284
	:	
LAWRENCE MAHALLY, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
<i>Respondents.</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of August, 2017, upon careful and independent consideration of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and the amended claims (ECF Nos. 1, 13, 20, and 21), the Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 18), Petitioner’s Reply (ECF No. 19), the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable Henry S. Perkin, U.S. Magistrate Judge, (ECF No. 26), Petitioner’s timely Objections thereto (ECF No. 29), the Response to the Objections (ECF No. 31), and Petitioner’s Reply (ECF No. 32), it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, (ECF No. 1), is **DENIED** with prejudice;¹

¹ This Court has reviewed Petitioner’s filings, the Government’s responses, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (R&R), and Petitioner’s Objections thereto, as required for “de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis and sees no basis for reversing his well-reasoned recommendations. *See id.* (“A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”).

Petitioner’s objections merely regurgitate all his original claims and arguments, and amount to a general objection to the entire R&R. In essence, Petitioner is dissatisfied with the Magistrate Judge’s decision (and the decisions of the state courts) not because of any discernible error of law or fact, but because the courts simply disagreed with his interpretation of events. Furthermore, Petitioner’s arguments are difficult to follow and oscillate between cognizable and non-cognizable *habeas* claims. As Judge Perkin aptly observed, “it is very difficult from Petitioner’s filings to decipher precisely what he is attempting argue (*sic*).” R&R 9. Judge Perkin’s R&R captures the crux of each of Petitioner’s claims and provides a thorough review of the relevant factual and legal issues. For this Court to issue a full opinion effectively agreeing with the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations “where only a general objection to the report is offered would undermine the efficiency the magistrate system was meant to contribute to the judicial process.” *Oser v. Samuels*, No. 12-cv-2535, 2013 WL 2351346, at *1 (M.D. Pa. May 22,

3. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability; and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case for statistical and all purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ C. Darnell Jones, II

C. Darnell Jones, II J.