

1 WO

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9 Kathy Ann Fisher,

No. CV-12-02307-PHX-GMS

10

Petitioner,

**ORDER**

11

v.

12

Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

13

Respondents.

14

15

Pending before the Court are Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and United States Magistrate Judge Bridget S. Bade's Report and Recommendation ("R&R"). Docs. 1, 11. The R&R recommends that the Court deny the Petition. Doc. 11 at 9. 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 9 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72; *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)).

20

21

22

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 ("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 accept the R&R and deny the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that

23

24

25

26

27


28

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

5 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 6 1. Magistrate Judge Bade’s R&R (Doc. 11) is **accepted**.
- 7 2. Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is **denied**.
- 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 30th day of May, 2013.

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