

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8
9 Laura L. Medley,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

13 Defendants.

No. CV-12-00762-PHX-GMS

ORDER

14
15 Pending before the Court are Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and
16 United States Magistrate Judge Bridget S. Bade's Report and Recommendation ("R&R").
17 Docs. 1, 13. The R&R recommends that the Court deny the Petition. Doc. 13 at 9. The
18 Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the
19 R&R and that failure to file timely objections could be considered a waiver of the right to
20 obtain review of the R&R. *Id.* at 10 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72;
21 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)).


22 The parties did not file objections, which relieves the Court of its obligation to
23 review the R&R. *See Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d at 1121; *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149
24 (1985) ("[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any review at all . . . of any issue that is
25 not the subject of an objection."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) ("The district judge must
26 determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly
27 objected to."). The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and finds that it is well-
28 taken. The Court will accept the R&R and deny the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)

1 (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the
2 findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The
3 district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further
4 evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.”).

5 **IT IS ORDERED:**

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

13 Dated this 8th day of January, 2013.

14 
15 _____
16 G. Murray Snow
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28