Petitioner, a former federal inmate proceeding pro se, filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On April 1, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. ECF No. 18. Neither party filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court //////

...."). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

Although it appears from the file that petitioner's copy of the Findings and Recommendations was returned, petitioner was properly served. It is the petitioner's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. In accordance with Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 18) are adopted.
- 2. Petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) is denied as moot based upon petitioner's release from confinement.
 - 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

DATED: May 1, 2024.

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE