

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Jesus Razo,	)	No. CV 08-1106 PHX-NVW (JM)
	)	
Petitioner,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Warden Blair, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

---

Pending before the court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Marshall (Doc. # 33) regarding petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. # 1). The R&R recommends that the Petition be denied and dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had ten days to file objections to the R&R. (R&R at 24 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)). By order of March 3, 2010, the Court extended Petitioner’s time to file objections by 30 days, which expired March 29, 2010. No objections have been filed.

Because the parties did not file objections, the court need not review any of the Magistrate Judge’s determinations on dispositive matters. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (“[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). The absence of a timely objection also means that error may not be assigned on appeal to any defect in the rulings of the Magistrate Judge on any non-dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) (“A

1 party may serve and file objections to the order within 10 days after being served with a copy  
2 [of the magistrate's order]. A party may not assign as error a defect in the order not timely  
3 objected to.”); *Simpson v. Lear Astronics Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1170, 1174 (9th Cir. 1996); *Philipps*  
4 *v. GMC*, 289 F.3d 1117, 1120-21 (9th Cir. 2002).

5 Notwithstanding the absence of an objection, the court has reviewed the R&R and  
6 finds that it is well taken. The court will accept the R&R and dismiss the Petition. *See* 28  
7 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or  
8 in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”).

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate  
10 Judge (Doc. #33) is accepted.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court enter judgment denying  
12 petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. #  
13 1). The Clerk shall terminate this action.

14 Dated: April 9, 2010.

15  
16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
Neil V. Wake  
United States District Judge