

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Richard Michael Lona,	}	No. CV-14-01227-PHX-SPL
	}	
Petitioner,	}	ORDER
vs.	}	
	}	
Charles L. Ryan, et al.,	}	
	}	
Respondents.	}	

Petitioner Richard Michael Lona has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1). The Honorable David K. Duncan, United States Magistrate Judge, issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 9), recommending that the Court deny the Petition. Judge Duncan advised the parties that they had fourteen (14) 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. (Doc. 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)).

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(b)(3) (“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-

1 taken. The Court will adopt the R&R and deny the Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)
2 (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the
3 findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The
4 district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further
5 evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.”). Accordingly,

6 **IT IS ORDERED:**


7 1. That Magistrate Judge Duncan’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9) is
8 **accepted** and **adopted** by the Court;

9 2. That the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254
10 (Doc. 1) is **denied** and **dismissed with prejudice**;

11 3. That a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on
12 appeal are **denied**; and

13 4. That the Clerk of Court shall **terminate** this action.

14 Dated this 8th day of July, 2015.

15 
16 _____
17 Honorable Steven P. Logan
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28