

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EDDIE JAMES HAWKINS,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:14-cv-1191

v.

HON. JANET T. NEFF

JOAN ROGGENBUCK,

Respondent.

**ORDER**

This is a habeas corpus petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued an Amended Report and Recommendation on February 9, 2017, recommending that this Court deny the petition. The Report and Recommendation was duly served on the parties.<sup>1</sup> No objections have been filed, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and the Court issues this Order. The Court will also issue a Judgment in this § 2254 proceeding. *See Gillis v. United States*, 729 F.3d 641, 643 (6th Cir. 2013) (requiring a separate judgment in habeas proceedings). Therefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Amended Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt 13) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court and the petition for habeas corpus relief (Dkt 1) is DENIED for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Service of the Report and Recommendation on Petitioner was returned, marked “return to sender,” “not at this address,” and “paroled to Kalamazoo on 6-30-16” (Dkt 14). Petitioner has failed to keep the Court apprised of his current address.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) is DENIED as to each issue asserted. *See* RULES GOVERNING § 2254 CASES, Rule 11 (requiring the district court to “issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order”). Petitioner has not demonstrated that reasonable jurists would find the Court’s rulings debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000); *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466, 466-67 (6th Cir. 2001).

Dated: March 3, 2017

/s/ Janet T. Neff  
JANET T. NEFF  
United States District Judge