

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

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

7

8

9

Richard Scott Jongeward,

)

No. CV-08-562-PHX-GMS  
No. CV-09-1252-PHX-GMS  
(Consolidated)

10

Petitioner,

)

11

v.

)

**ORDER**

12

Charles Ryan, et al.,

)

13

Respondents.

)

14

\_\_\_\_\_

15

16

Pending before the Court are Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and United States Magistrate Judge Jacqueline Marshall’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) **in case No. 09-1252-PHX-GMS.** (Doc. 1, 36). The R&R recommends that the Court dismiss the Petition. (Doc. 36 at 16). The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R and that failure to file timely objections could be considered a waiver of the right to obtain review of the R&R. *Id.* at 16-17 (citing *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*)).

23

Despite being advised of his ability to file objections to the R&R, Petitioner did not file an objection, but instead filed a Notice of Appeal (Doc. 38). Even should this Court consider the Notice of Appeal as an objection, it contains no objections to the R&R. Because Petitioner did not raise any objections to the R&R, the Court is relieved of its obligation to review the R&R. *See Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d at 1121; *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

28

1 the subject of an objection.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge must determine  
2 de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”).  
3 The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and finds that it is well-taken. The Court will  
4 accept the R&R and dismiss the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district  
5 court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations  
6 made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge may accept, reject,  
7 or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the  
8 magistrate judge with instructions.”).

9 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 10 1. Magistrate Judge Marshall’s R&R (Doc. 36) is **ACCEPTED**.
- 11 2. Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) filed in Case No. CV-  
12 09-1252-PHX-GMS is **DISMISSED**.
- 13 3. The Clerk of the Court shall **TERMINATE** both actions.
- 14 4. Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, in the even  
15 Petitioner files an appeal, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability because  
16 reasonable jurists would not find the Court’s procedural ruling debatable. *See Slack v.*  
17 *McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

18 DATED this 23rd day of September, 2010.

19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 G. Murray Snow  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28