

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9

Mohamad Ruhul Amid,

)

No. CV 11-0924-PHX-JAT

10

Petitioner,

)

ORDER

11

vs.

)

12

Katrina Kane, et al.,

)

13

Respondents.

)

14

15

16

Pending before the Court is Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. At the time he filed his Petition (May 9, 2011), Petitioner was in immigration detention awaiting removal. On February 15, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 20) recommending that the Petition be denied as moot because Petitioner is no longer in immigration detention.

21

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).

28

Based on the foregoing,

