| (HC) Olivo v. | r. Reece et al | |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | AUGUSTINE OLIVO, | |
| 11 | Petitioner, | No. CIV S-07-02452 WBS CHS P |
| 12 | VS. | |
| 13 | RICHARD IVES, Warden, et al., | |
| 14 | Respondents. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 15 | | _/ |
| 16 | Petitioner, a federal inmate proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ | |
| 17 | of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter was referred to a United States | |
| 18 | Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262. | |
| 19 | On September 4, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations | |
| 20 | herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any | |
| 21 | objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Neither | |
| 22 | party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations. | |
| 23 | The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be | |
| 24 | supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY | |
| 25 | ORDERED that: | |
| 26 | ///// | |
| | | 1 |

Doc. 31

| 1 | 1. The findings and recommendations filed on September 4, 2009, are adopted in |
|----|--|
| 2 | full; and |
| | |
| 3 | 2. Petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied. |
| 4 | DATED: October 2, 2009 |
| 5 | william Va Shubt |
| 6 | WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| | |
| 24 | |