

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8

9 Adrian Vasquez,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

13 Respondents.
14

No. CV-14-00896-PHX-NVW

ORDER

15 Before the court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge
16 David K. Duncan (Doc. 11) regarding petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
17 filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1). The R&R recommends that the Petition be
18 denied and dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they
19 had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R. (Doc. 11 at 5.) No objections were
20 filed.

21 Because the parties did not file objections, the court need not review any of the
22 Magistrate Judge’s determinations on dispositive matters. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1);
23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003);
24 *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (“[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any
25 review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). The absence of a
26 timely objection also means that error may not be assigned on appeal to any defect in the
27 rulings of the Magistrate Judge on any non-dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) (“A
28 party may serve and file objections to the order within 14 days after being served with a

1 copy [of the magistrate’s order]. A party may not assign as error a defect in the order not
2 timely objected to.”); *Simpson v. Lear Astronics Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1170, 1174 (9th Cir.
3 1996); *Phillips v. GMC*, 289 F.3d 1117, 1120-21 (9th Cir. 2002).

4 Notwithstanding the absence of an objection, the court has reviewed the R&R and
5 finds that it is well taken. The court will accept the R&R and dismiss the Petition. *See*
6 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in
7 whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”).

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Report and Recommendation of the
9 Magistrate Judge (Doc. 11) is accepted.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court enter judgment denying
11 and dismissing petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28
12 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1) with prejudice. The Clerk shall terminate this action.

13 Having considered the issuance of a Certificate of Appealability from the order
14 denying Petitioner’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, the Court FINDS: Certificate
15 of Appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal are **denied** because
16 Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

17 Dated this 16th day of July, 2015.

18
19 
20 Neil V. Wake
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28