

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 Kenneth Lane,
Petitioner,
vs.
Charles L. Ryan, et al.,
Respondents.

No. CV-12-08014-PCT-NVW (DKD)

**ORDER
AND
DENIAL OF CERTIFICATE OF
APPEALABILITY AND IN FORMA
PAUPERIS STATUS**

Pending before the court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge David K. Duncan (Doc. 16) regarding petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1). The R&R recommends that the Petition be denied and dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R. (R&R at P. 6, ln. 20 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)). Petitioner filed objections on May 14, 2013 (Doc. 20).


The court has considered the objections and reviewed the Report and Recommendation de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made). The court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s determinations, accepts the recommended decision within the meaning of Rule 72(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., and overrules Petitioner’s objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate”).

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Report and Recommendation of the
2 Magistrate Judge (Doc. 16) is accepted.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court enter judgment denying
4 and dismissing petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
5 § 2254 (Doc. 1) with prejudice. The Clerk shall terminate this action.

6 Having considered the issuance of a Certificate of Appealability from the order
7 denying Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, a Certificate of Appealability
8 and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal are **denied** because dismissal of the
9 Petition is justified by a plain procedural bar and jurists of reason would not find the
10 ruling debatable.

11 Dated this 15th day of May, 2013.

12
13 

14 _____
15 Neil V. Wake
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28