

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Edward James Harris v. Edward J. Silva**

No. EDCV 24-1306-WDK (JPR) · No. EDCV 24-1306-WDK (JPR) · Decided July 31, 2025

---

**OPINION**

Edward James Harris v. Tammy Campbell

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 EDWARD JAMES HARRIS ) No. EDCV 24-1306-WDK (JPR)

) 12 Petitioner, ) ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE

) JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

13 v. ) ) 14 EDWARD J. SILVA, Acting ) Warden, ) 15 ) Respondent. ) 16 17 Pursuant to 28  
U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the 18 First Amended Petition, Respondent’s motion to  
dismiss, 19 Petitioner’s opposition, the other records on file herein, the 20 Magistrate Judge’s  
Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), and 21 Petitioner’s Objections to the R&R (“Objections”).  
The Court has 22 reviewed de novo those identifiable portions of the R&R to which 23 Petitioner  
has timely and properly objected. See 28 U.S.C. § 24 636(b)(1)©; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); United  
States v. Reyna-Tapia, 25 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). 26 In doing so, the Court  
has declined to consider any 27 arguments raised for the first time only in the objections. See 28  
United States v. Howell, 231 F.3d 615, 621-23 (9th Cir. 2000). has also declined to consider  
objections that simply repeat 2 /arguments fully addressed but rejected in the R&R. See Trejo 3 ||  
Perez v. Madden, 2020 WL 1154807, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2020) 4] (objections that “merely  
repeat[] the same arguments .. . 5 | considered and found to be insufficient” require no review  
since 6 | they “do not meaningfully dispute the magistrate judge’s findings and  
recommendations”); Hagberg v. Astrue, 2009 WL 3386595, at \*1 (D. Mont. Oct. 14, 2009)  
(“Objections to a magistrate’s Findings and Recommendations are not a vehicle for the losing  
party to 10 | relitigate its case.”). Finally, the Court has declined to consider any blanket or  
boilerplate objection to the final 12 || disposition recommended in the R&R. See McCulloch v.  
Tharratt, 13 2017 WL 6398611, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2017). 14 Concluding that nothing in  
Petitioner’s Objections affects 15 | the material findings and conclusions in the R&R, the Court 16  
|| accepts the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. 17 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS  
ORDERED THAT: 18 1. Respondent motion to dismiss is granted. 19 2. The First Amended

Petition is dismissed without 20 || prejudice. 21 3. Judgment be entered consistent with this order.  
22 4, The clerk serve this Order on all counsel or parties of 23 || record. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
25 . Aiftcet 2 Jette 26 |) DATED: July 31, 2025

WILLIAM D. KELLER

27 U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

28