

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

DALE WESLEY HUBBARD, Jr.,
Petitioner,
v.
GLENN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,
Respondent.

No. 2:20-cv-01232 KJM GGH P

ORDER

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. 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 August 7, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. ECF No. 5. Petitioner has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

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


¹ While petitioner’s service copy of the findings and recommendations was returned as undeliverable, it is petitioner’s obligation to keep the court apprised of any change in address.

1 by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court
2 . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be
3 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 7, 2020, are adopted in full;
- 6 2. Petitioner’s application for a writ of habeas corpus is summarily dismissed; and
- 7 3. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C.
8 § 2253.

9 DATED: October 15, 2020.

10 
11 _____
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28