

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA


7 Mercedes Navarro,)
8 Petitioner,) CV 08-0642-PHX-PGR (MHB)
9 v.) **ORDER**
10 Dora B. Schriro, et al.,)
11 Respondents.)
12

13 The Court having reviewed *de novo* the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate
14 Judge Burns and no party having filed any objection to the Report and Recommendation,

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation
16 **(Doc. 8)** is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** by the Court.¹

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
18 **(Doc. 1)** is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

19 DATED this 10th day of December, 2008.

20 
21 Paul G. Rosenblatt
22 United States District Judge

23 ¹ The Magistrate Judge found that Petitioner’s claims are procedurally barred because
24 at this late date she cannot return to the state courts to present her claims. *See* Ariz. R.Crim.
25 P. 32.1, 32.2(a) & (b); *see generally* *Stewart v. Smith*, 536 U.S. 856, 860-61 (2002)(holding
26 that Rule 32.2(a) is an adequate and independent procedural bar). Additionally, she would
27 be time-barred from seeking appellate review of the trial court’s denial of her PCR. *See* Ariz.
28 R. Crim. P. 32.9(c). Any return now to state court would therefore be futile. Therefore,
Petitioner’s claims are procedurally defaulted. Furthermore, Petitioner has not claimed or
demonstrated that a miscarriage of justice would result if her claims are not considered, or
that cause exists for her noncompliance with state procedural rules.