



1 violated the Magistrate Act and Habeas Rule 8(b) by failing to conduct *de novo* review of  
2 his Motion for an Evidentiary Hearing. Dkt. # 27 at 1. Petitioner also claims this Court  
3 “asserted a procedural defense not made by respondent.” Dkt. # 29 at 1.

4 To the extent Petitioner challenges *de novo* review of any motion filed before the  
5 Court adopted the Report, the Court properly considered all pleadings. *See* Dkt. # 14 at 1-  
6 2. Furthermore, the Court did not “assert a procedural defense not made by respondent.”  
7 *See* Dkt. # 29 at 1.

8 Petitioner has consistently taken advantage of valuable judicial resources by filing  
9 a surfeit of meritless motions. He also appears to disregard prior orders. None of the  
10 motions alters the uncontested fact that the habeas petition filed in this case is time-barred.  
11 The Court will not consider any further filings from Petitioner.

### 12 III. CONCLUSION

13 For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** the pending motions. Dkts. ## 27,  
14 29. The Clerk is **INSTRUCTED** not to accept any further filings in this case.

15 Dated this 25th day of November, 2024.

16 

17  
18 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24