

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**

Marco Antonio Salazar,
Petitioner,
v.
Charles L Ryan, et al.,
Respondents.

No. CV-15-02083-PHX-DLR
ORDER

Before the Court is Petitioner Marco A. Salazar’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and United States Magistrate Judge John Z. Boyle’s Report and Recommendation (R&R). Docs. 1, 16. The R&R recommends that the Court deny the Petition. Doc. 16 at 5. 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 6 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)). Petitioner 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-taken. The Court will accept the R&R and

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


6 **IT IS ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Boyle’s R&R, Doc. 16, is **ACCEPTED**.
7 Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Doc. 1, is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED**
8 **WITH PREJUDICE**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a Certificate of Appealability and leave to
10 proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal are **DENIED** because the dismissal of the Petition is
11 justified by a plain procedural bar and reasonable jurists would not find the ruling
12 debatable, and because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a
13 constitutional right.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall terminate this
15 case.

16 Dated this 6th day of June, 2016.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Douglas L. Rayes
United States District Judge