Raboy v. U	ISA
------------	-----

1	wo		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
8			
9	Stephen Ross Raboy,	CV-16-02106-PHX-JAT CR-09-00678-PHX-JAT	
10	Petitioner,	ORDER	
11	V.		
12	United States of America,		
13	Respondent.		
14			
15	Pending before the Court is Movant's Successive Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or		
16	Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 10). The Magistrate Judge issued a		
17	Report and Recommendation (R&R) (Doc. 23) recommending that the Motion be denied.		
18	Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby		
19 20	accepts the R&R. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not required to conduct "any review at all of any issue that is not the subject of an		
20			
21	objection" (emphasis added)); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate		
22 23	judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise"		
23 24	(emphasis in original)); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz.		
24	2003).		
23 26	Accordingly,		
20	IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc.		
28	23) is accepted and adopted;		
_0			

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Movant's Successive Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 10) is denied and dismissed with prejudice; the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that a Certificate of Appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal are denied because jurists of reason would not find this Court's procedural ruling debatable.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2020.

James A. Teilborg Senior United States District Judge