

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSEPH A. SHERMAN,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-02-0373 FCD DAD P

vs.

CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, et al.,

ORDER

Respondents.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On October 21, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Petitioner has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

Although it appears from the file that petitioner's copy of the findings and recommendations were returned, petitioner was properly served. It is the petitioner's

////

1 responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local  
2 Rule 83-182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

3 The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be  
4 supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY  
5 ORDERED that:

6 1. The findings and recommendations filed October 21, 2005, are adopted in full;

7 and

8 2. Petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

9 DATED: November 21, 2005

10  
11 /s/ Frank C. Damrell Jr.  
12 FRANK C. DAMRELL JR.  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26