

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS RUTLEDGE,

 Petitioner,

 v.

DEAN GROWDON, SHERIFF,

 Respondent.

No. 2:18-cv-1600 KJM AC P

ORDER

Petitioner, formerly a county jail inmate proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. ECF No. 1. 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 February 12, 2021, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, which were served on petitioner and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. ECF No. 9. Petitioner has not 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

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

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


4 1. The findings and recommendations issued February 12, 2021 (ECF No. 9), are
5 ADOPTED in full;

6 2. Petitioner’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is DENIED as moot;

7 3. Petitioner’s application for a writ of habeas corpus is SUMMARILY DENIED for
8 failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; and

9 4. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C.
10 § 2253.

11 DATED: March 31, 2021.

12
13 
14 _____
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28