

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

MESMER HAGOS,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:18-cv-0034-MHH-TMP
)	
ATTORNEY GENERAL)	
JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS, III,)	
<i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On February 26, 2018, the magistrate judge filed a report in which he recommended that the Court dismiss as moot petitioner Mesmer Hagos’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition for writ of habeas corpus. (Doc. 9). The magistrate judge advised the parties of their right to file objections within 14 days. (Doc. 9, pp. 2-3). To date, no party has filed objections to the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation.¹

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court reviews legal conclusions in a report de novo and reviews for plain


¹ On February 26, 2018, the Clerk of Court mailed to Mr. Hagos a copy of the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. (February 26, 2018 staff note). On March 12, 2018, the Postal Service returned as undeliverable Mr. Hagos’s copy of the report and recommendation. (Doc. 10; Doc. 11).

error factual findings to which no objection is made. *Garvey v. Vaughn*, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993); *see also LoConte v. Dugger*, 847 F.2d 745, 749 (11th Cir. 1988); *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 Fed. Appx. 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006).²

Having reviewed the record in this case, including the report and recommendation, the Court finds no misstatements of law in the report and no plain error in the magistrate judge's description of the relevant facts. Therefore, the Court adopts the magistrate judge's report and accepts his recommendation.

The Court will enter a separate final order consistent with this memorandum opinion.

DONE and **ORDERED** this March 13, 2018.



MADELINE HUGHES HAIKALA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² When a party objects to a report in which a magistrate judge recommends dismissal of the action, a district court must “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(B)-(C).