1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	EASIERN DISIRICI OF CALIFORNIA	
8	THOMAS C. SCHUSTER,	1:10-cv-01983-AWI-SKO-HC
9	Petitioner,) ORDER RE: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (DOC. 14)
10	V.) ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S
11 12	(EN CLARK, Warden,) (DOCS. 10, 1)	MOTION TO DISMISS THE PETITION (DOCS. 10, 1)
12	Respondent.) ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND (DOC. 1)
14	,,,,,,	ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE A
15		CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY AND DIRECTING THE CLERK TO CLOSE THE CASE
16		
17	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in	
18	forma pauperis with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant	
19	to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to the Magistrate	
20	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rules 302 and	
21	304.	
22	On May 31, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and	
23	recommendations to grant Respondent's motion to dismiss without	
24	leave to amend Petitioner's first and second due process claims	
25 26	concerning some evidence, to dismiss Petitioner's remaining	
26 27	claims without leave to amend, to decline to issue a certificate	
27	of appealability, and to direct the Clerk to close the case.	
28	The findings and recommendations were served on all parties	
		1

1

on the same date. The findings and recommendations informed
 Petitioner that objections were due within thirty days of
 service.

4 On June 17, 2011, Petitioner filed timely objections to the
5 findings and recommendations. Although the period for filing a
6 reply has passed, no reply has been filed.

7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 8 (b) (1) (C), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. 9 The undersigned has carefully reviewed the entire file and has 10 considered the objections; the undersigned has determined there 11 is no need to modify the findings and recommendations based on 12 the points raised in the objections. The Court finds that the 13 report and recommendation is supported by the record and proper 14 analysis.

15

18

23

25

26

27

28

Accordingly, it IS ORDERED that:

1) The findings and recommendations filed on May 31, 2011,
 17 are ADOPTED in full;

2) Respondent's motion to dismiss is GRANTED;

19 3) The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED20 without leave to amend;

21 4) The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of22 appealability; and

5) The Clerk is DIRECTED to close the action.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 22, 2011

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE