

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BERNARD FLORES,)	Civil No. 10cv1370 AJB (BGS)
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER: (1) ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [Doc. No. 16]; (2) GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE; AND (3) DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY
v.)	
GEORGE NEOTTI, Warden,)	
Respondent.)	

Before the Court is Bernard Flores’s Petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Pending before the Court is Respondent’s motion to dismiss the petition, filed March 25, 2011. (Doc. No. 14.) Petitioner filed an opposition on April 21, 2011. (Doc. No. 15.)

The Court referred the matter to Magistrate Judge Bernard G. Skomal, who issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending the Court dismiss the Petition on the merits and decline to issue a certificate of appealability. (R&R, Doc. No. 16.)


Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) set forth a district judge’s duties in connection with a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. The district judge must “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report to which objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the finding or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. Remsing*, 874 F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1989). However, in the absence of timely objection(s), the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear

1 error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory
2 Committee Notes (1983); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).

3 Neither party has timely filed objections to Magistrate Judge Skomal’s Report and Recommen-
4 dation. (*See* Order of September 14, 2011, Granting Petitioner Extension of Time to File Objections,
5 Doc. No. 19, (objections due by September 28, 2011).) Having reviewed the report and recommenda-
6 tion, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Skomal’s Report and Recommendation is thorough, well
7 reasoned, and contains no clear error. Accordingly, the Court hereby: (1) **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge
8 Skomal’s Report and Recommendation; (2) **GRANTS** Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice,
9 [Doc. No. 14], and (3) **DECLINES** to issue a certificate of appealability.¹

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11
12 DATED: January 5, 2012

13 
14 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
U.S. District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 ¹ When a district court enters a final order adverse to the applicant in a habeas proceeding, it
26 must either issue or deny a certificate of appealability. Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254
27 Cases. A certificate of appealability is required to appeal a final order in a habeas proceeding. 28 U.S.C.
28 § 2253(c)(1)(A). A certificate of appealability is appropriate only where the petitioner makes “a
substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336
(2003). Under this standard, the petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists could debate whether
the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate
to deserve encouragement to proceed further. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 474
(2000).