

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

THOMAS J. GRIDER,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	2:14-cv-2134-LSC-JEO
)	
)	
THE STATE OF ALABAMA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	


MEMORANDUM OPINION

This is an action on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. It was filed by Thomas J. Grider, an Alabama state prisoner acting *pro se*. (Doc. 1). Grider has also filed a motion to expand the record, requesting that the State be required to furnish certain portions of the record from his underlying state-court criminal proceeding. (Doc. 8). On January 26, 2015, the magistrate judge entered a report and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), recommending that Grider’s habeas application be denied on the ground that it is barred under statute of limitations, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1) and that his motion to expand the record likewise be denied. (Doc. 9). Grider was given 14 days in which to file an objection to the R&R. During that objection period Grider twice filed the same letter addressed to the undersigned district judge. (*See* Docs. 10, 11). However, that correspondence is more aptly characterized as a general plea for fair consideration of his case than an effort to raise any particular objection to the R&R. Then, on February 9, 2015, Grider placed in the prison mailbox for mailing an additional objection, which was docketed by this Court on February 12, 2015.

(Doc. 12.) The objection period has now expired.

Having carefully reviewed and considered *de novo* all the materials in the court file, including the magistrate judge's report and recommendation (Doc. 9) and the Petitioner's submissions in response thereto, the court is of the opinion that the magistrate judge's findings are due to be and are hereby **ADOPTED** and his recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. Petitioner's objections, such as they are, are **OVERRULED**. As a result, the petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) and petitioner's motion to expand the record (Doc. 8) are both due to be **DENIED** and this action is due to **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. Furthermore, because the petition does not present issues that are debatable among jurists of reason, a certificate of appealability is also due to be **DENIED**. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000); Rule 11(a), RULES GOVERNING § 2254 PROCEEDINGS. A separate Final Judgment will be entered.

Done this 17th day of February 2015.



L. Scott Coogler
United States District Judge
[160704]