

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

**WO**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Keith T. Parker,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Warden J. Stems; et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV 10-2616-PHX-JAT

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Petition”) (Doc. 1). The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 16) recommending that the Petition be denied as untimely.

Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby accepts the R&R. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection” (emphasis added)); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (“statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003).


Based on the foregoing,

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16) is **ACCEPTED**; accordingly,

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

- Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is denied and dismissed with prejudice as untimely,
- because the Petition is untimely and a stay would not change the timeliness of the Petition, Petitioner’s motion to stay (Doc. 9) is denied,
- in the event Petitioner files an appeal, issuance of a certificate of appealability is denied because denial of the Petition is based on a plain procedural bar and jurists of reason would not find this Court’s procedural ruling debatable. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000), and
- the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment of dismissal with prejudice.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James A. Teilborg  
United States District Judge