

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

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

7

8

9

Daniel Roy Organ,

)

No. CV-11-158-PHX-GMS (LOA)

10

Petitioner,

)

ORDER

11

v.

)

12

Margaret Callaway, 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 Anderson’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”). Doc. 1, 15. The R&R recommends that the Court deny the petition. Doc. 15 at 7. 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 8 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, 6(a), 6(e); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)).

23

The parties did not file objections, which relieves the Court 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 the subject of an objection.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”). The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and finds that it is well-taken. The Court will

24

25

26

27


28

1 accept the R&R and deny the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district
2 court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations
3 made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge may accept, reject,
4 or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the
5 magistrate judge with instructions.”).

6 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 7 1. Magistrate Judge Anderson’s R&R (Doc. 15) is **accepted**.
- 8 2. Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is **denied**.
- 9 3. The Clerk of Court shall **terminate** this action.
- 10 4. Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, in the event
11 Petitioner files an appeal, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability because
12 reasonable jurists would not find the Court’s procedural ruling debatable. *See Slack v.*
13 *McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

14 DATED this 1st day of November, 2011.

15
16 
17 _____
18 G. Murray Snow
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28