

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

RANDY L. BLACK,
Petitioner,
v.
WARDEN PAUL THOMPSON,
Respondents.

No. 2:21-cv-2228 KJM KJN P

ORDER

Petitioner, a federal prisoner 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 March 4, 2022, 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 fourteen days. Petitioner did not file 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 filed March 04, 2022, are adopted in full;
- 5 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice; and
- 6 3. The clerk of court is directed to close this case.

7 DATED: May 23, 2022.

8
9 
10 _____
11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28