

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

DANIEL THOMPSON,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:09-CV-976

v.

HON. GORDON J. QUIST

BLAINE LAFLER,

Respondent.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING**  
**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation filed by the United States Magistrate Judge in this action. The Report and Recommendation was duly served on Petitioner on April 26, 2012. No objections have been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).<sup>1</sup> Therefore the Court will adopt the Report and Recommendation.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the Court must also determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The Sixth Circuit has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466, 467 (6th Cir. 2001). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* at 467. Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that the copy of the Report and Recommendation sent to Petitioner was returned to the Clerk marked “Return to Sender Due to: Out on Writ.” (Dkt. # 22.) A petitioner has a continuing obligation to keep the court informed of his current address. *See Prea v. Battaista*, No. 91 Civ. 1171 (TPG), 1993 WL 97423 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 30, 1993). Petitioner failed to comply with this obligation.

120 S. Ct. 1595 (2000). *Murphy*, 263 F.3d at 467. Consequently, this Court has examined Petitioner's claims under the *Slack* standard.

Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, 120 S. Ct. at 1604, to warrant a grant of the certificate, “[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, the Court finds that reasonable jurists could not find that this Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s claim was debatable or wrong. Thus, the Court will deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, filed April 25, 2012, is approved and adopted as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner’s habeas corpus petition is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a **certificate of appealability** is **DENIED** by this Court.

This case is **concluded**.

Dated: May 18, 2012

---

/s/ Gordon J. Quist  
GORDON J. QUIST  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE