(HC) Carlyle v. Marshall	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	DOUGLAS RANDALL CARYLE,
12	Petitioner, 2:08-cv-1736-GEB-GGH-P
13	VS.
14	JOHN MARSHALL, et al.,
15	Respondents. <u>ORDER</u>
16	/
17	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this application for a writ
18	of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.
20	On December 5, 2008, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
21	herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any
22	objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. January 5,
23	2009, petitioner filed his objections as well as a request for extension of time to file his
24	objections. Good cause appearing, his objections are deemed timely filed.
25	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule
26	72-304, this court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
	1

Doc. 15

entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Petitioner's January 5, 2009, request for an extension of time (Docket No. 13) is granted; petitioner's objections are deemed timely filed; 2. The findings and recommendations filed December 5, 2008, are adopted in full; and 3. Respondent's September 3, 2008, motion to dismiss (Docket No. 7) is granted. Dated: January 23, 2009