

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

Charlie L. Morgan,	}	No. CV-15-02646-PHX-SPL
	}	
Petitioner,	}	ORDER
vs.	}	
	}	
Charles Ryan, et al.,	}	
	}	
Respondents.	}	

Petitioner Charlie L. Morgan has filed an Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 8). The Honorable James F. Metcalf, United States Magistrate Judge, issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 21), recommending that the Court deny the Petition. Judge Metcalf 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. 21 at 12); 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 Metcalf’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 21) is
8 **accepted** and **adopted** by the Court;
- 9 2. That the Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28
10 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 8) is **denied** and this action is **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 22nd day of November, 2016.

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