

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT VARDANYAN,)	1:07-cv-01246 OWW-TAG (HC)
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
)	RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. 18)
v.)	
ANTONIO GONZALES, et al.,)	ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT
)	OF HABEAS CORPUS (Doc. 1)
Respondents.)	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO
)	ENTER JUDGMENT

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On October 31, 2008, the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case filed Findings and Recommendations recommending that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied. [\(Doc. 18\)](#). The Findings and Recommendations were served on all parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within fifteen days from the date of service of that order. Petitioner requested, and was granted, an extension of time to file his objections until December 29, 2008. [\(Doc. 20\)](#). To date, however, no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations have been filed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

///

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Findings and Recommendations filed October 31, 2008 (Doc. 18), are ADOPTED IN FULL;
2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED; and
3. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT for Respondent and close the file.

This order terminates the action in its entirety. The plain language of 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) does not require a certificate of appealability because this is an appeal from an order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, not a final order in a habeas proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court. Forde v. U.S. Parole Commission, 114 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 1997); Ojo v. I.N.S., 106 F.3d 680, 681-682 (5th Cir. 1997); Bradshaw v. Story, 86 F.3d 164, 166 (10th Cir. 1996).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 9, 2009

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE