

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

MARK GRAHAM,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	2:20-cv-00315-JDL
)	
STATE OF MAINE,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Mark Graham seeks habeas relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2020), contending that he is being held pretrial in violation of his due process rights and his right to a speedy trial (ECF No. 1, 2, 5). United States Magistrate Judge John C. Nivison submitted a Recommended Decision addressing Graham’s petitions on October 5, 2020 (ECF No. 9), pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2020) and Rule 10 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, recommending that the petitions be denied.

Three days prior to the entry of the Recommended Decision on the docket, Graham filed a supplemental petition, which the Recommended Decision did not address (ECF No. 8). He filed an additional supplemental petition on October 5, the same date on which the Recommended Decision was submitted (ECF No. 10). On November 16, the Court received Graham’s Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 12), which was postmarked November 9.

Because Graham is acting pro se, his submissions are “to be liberally construed,” and “must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erikson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). “The pleadings of a pro se plaintiff may be interpreted in light of his or her supplemental submissions.” *Flanders v. Mass Resistance*, No. 1:12-cv-00262-JAW, 2013 WL 2237848, at *9 (D. Me. May 21, 2013). Accordingly, I consider both of Graham’s additional supplemental petitions (ECF Nos. 8, 10), along with his Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 12), in deciding this matter. However, I note that these filings reiterate the same concerns with inmate abuse, due process, and speedy trial rights laid out in the petitions considered by the Magistrate Judge.

I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, and have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 9) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ACCEPTED** and Graham’s petitions (ECF Nos. 1, 2, 5, 8, 10) are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated this 29th day of December, 2020

/s/ Jon D. Levy
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE