

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MAXIMO DIAZLEAL-DIAZLEAL,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMES KEY,

Respondent.

CASE NO. C21-0068-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner’s objections (Dkt. No. 34) to the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Honorable Theresa L. Fricke, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 29). Having thoroughly considered the parties’ briefing and the relevant record, the Court hereby OVERRULES Petitioner’s objections, ADOPTS the R&R, and DISMISSES petitioner’s federal habeas corpus petition (Dkt. No. 3) with prejudice, for the reasons explained herein.

The facts and procedural history of this case are described in detail in Judge Fricke’s R&R, (*see generally*, Dkt. No. 29 at 1–7), and the Court will not repeat them here. The petitioner presents the Court with the following grounds for habeas corpus relief: (1) the trial court erred when it allowed a police detective to opine favorably on the victim’s demeanor during her joint victim interview; (2) the trial court erred by not striking another witness’ other bad act testimony; (3) the trial court incorrectly instructed the jury; and (4) the state presented

1 insufficient to find petitioner guilty of two identical crimes. (Dkt. No. 3 at 5–10.) Judge Fricke  
2 recommends this Court dismiss Claims 2 and 3 on two grounds. First, that Petitioner failed to  
3 exhaust available state remedies. (Dkt. No. 29 at 8–10); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1); *Baldwin v.*  
4 *Reese*, 541 U.S. 27, 29 (2004). Second, that the claims are procedurally default. (Dkt. No. 29 at  
5 10–12); *Martinez v. Ryan*, 566 U.S. 1, 9 (2012); *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 729–732  
6 (1991). Judge Fricke engaged the merits of Claims 1 and 4, and found Petitioner did not come  
7 close to showing the unreasonable application of clearly established federal law or an  
8 unreasonable determination of the facts. (Dkt. No. 29 at 15–19). Petitioner objected to Judge  
9 Fricke’s R&R, but failed to identify any specific issues for review. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 34.)

10         The Court reviews *de novo* those portions of a R&R to which a party objects. 28 U.S.C.  
11 § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Objections are required to enable the court to “focus  
12 attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.”  
13 *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). A party properly objects by timely filing “specific  
14 written objections” to the magistrate judge’s R&R as required under Federal Rule of Civil  
15 Procedure 72(b)(2). General objections, or summaries of arguments previously presented, have  
16 the same effect as no objection at all, since the Court’s attention is not focused on any specific  
17 issues for review. *See Simpson v. Lear Astronics Corp*, 77 F.3d 1170, 1175 (9th Cir. 1996); *see*  
18 *also Djelassi v. ICE Field Office Director*, 434 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (W.D. Wash. 2020) (district  
19 courts only review *de novo* “those portions of the report and recommendation to which specific  
20 written objection is made”).

21         Petitioner’s objections reiterate the merits of his claims, are filled with conclusory  
22 statements, summarize arguments previously presented, point to no specific error by Judge  
23 Fricke. (*Compare* Dkt. No. 28, *with* Dkt. No. 34). Thus, they amount to no objection at all, since  
24 they do not focus the Court’s attention on any specific issues for review. *See Howard v. Sec’y of*  
25 *Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). They provide the Court without a  
26 basis to reject the R&R.

1 For the foregoing reasons, the Court OVERRULES Petitioner’s objections, (Dkt. No. 34),  
2 ADOPTS Judge Fricke’s R&R, (Dkt. No. 29), and DISMISSES Petitioner’s habeas petition  
3 (Dkt. No. 3). Lastly, because no reasonable jurist could disagree with the findings in Judge  
4 Fricke’s R&R, the Court DENIES Petitioner’s request for a Certificate of Appealability.

5 DATED this 17th day of January 2023.

6   
7  
8

9 John C. Coughenour  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26