

1

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

9

Paul Mark Mosakowski,

No. CV-15-02010-PHX-GMS

10

Petitioner,

ORDER

11

v.

12

Charles L Ryan, et al.,

13

Respondents.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Pending before the Court is Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and United States Magistrate Judge Deborah M. Fine's Report and Recommendation ("R&R"). Docs. 1, 16. The R&R recommends that the Court deny the Petition and dismiss with prejudice. Doc. 16 at 13. 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 13 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, 6(a), 6(b); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)).

23

24

25

26

27

28


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

7 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 8 1. Magistrate Judge Fine’s R&R (Doc. 16) is **accepted**.
- 9 2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is denied and this action is
10 dismissed with prejudice.
- 11 3. Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, in the
12 event Petitioner files an appeal, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability
13 because reasonable jurists would not find the Court’s procedural ruling debatable. *See*
14 *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

15 Dated this 3rd day of February, 2017.

16
17 
18

Honorable G. Murray Snow
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28