

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9

David Allen Wiechens,

)

No. CV 13-0900-PHX-JAT

10

Petitioner,

)

ORDER

11

vs.

)

12

Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

)

13

Respondents.

)

14

)

15

)

16

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. 9) recommending that the Petition be denied and dismissed because it is barred by the statute of limitations.

20

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).

27

Based on the foregoing,


28

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9) is **ACCEPTED**; accordingly,

- Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is denied and dismissed with prejudice,
- 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 13th day of December, 2013.



James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge