Doc. 39 (HC) Puthuff v. Clark 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANTHONY MICHAEL PUTHUFF, No. No. 2:18-cv-2120-TLN-DB 12 Petitioner, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 KENT CLARK, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas 18 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 19 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On April 6, 2023, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which 21 were served on Petitioner and contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the findings 22 and recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. Petitioner has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations. 23 24 Although it appears from the file that Petitioner's copy of the findings and 25 recommendations was returned as undeliverable, Petitioner was properly served. It is Petitioner's 26 responsibility to keep the Court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local 27 Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. ///// 28 1

The Court reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

- 1. The findings and recommendations filed April 6, 2023 (ECF No. 38) are ADOPTED IN
- 2. The Second Amended Petition for writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 22) is DENIED with prejudice; and
- 3. The Court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge