

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TYRONE ANTHONY WALKER,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:20-cv-1220

v.

HONORABLE PAUL L. MALONEY

GREGORY SKIPPER,

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This is a habeas corpus petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation on August 11, 2021, recommending that this Court deny the petition. The Report and Recommendation was duly served on the parties. 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 Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 12) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court and the petition for habeas corpus relief (ECF No. 1) is DENIED for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

**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). For the same reasons the Court concludes that Plaintiff’s claims are properly dismissed, the Court also concludes that any issue Plaintiff might raise on appeal would be frivolous. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). Accordingly, the Court certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

Dated: September 9, 2021

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge