

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

EDWARD WILLIAMS, III,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	1:16CV531
	)	
FRANK L. PERRY,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER**

This matter is before this court for review of the Recommendation filed on November 30, 2016, by the Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Doc. 12.) In the Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 3) be granted, that Petitioner’s Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody (Doc. 1) be dismissed, and that judgment be entered dismissing this action. The Recommendation was served on the parties to this action on December 1, 2016 (Doc. 13) and on January 5, 2017 (Doc. 14). Petitioner timely filed objections (Doc. 15) to the Recommendation.


This court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Magistrate Judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.”

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the [M]agistrate [J]udge. . . . [O]r recommit the matter to the [M]agistrate [J]udge with instructions.” Id.

This court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Recommendation to which objections were made and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation. This court therefore adopts the Recommendation.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation (Doc. 12) is **ADOPTED**. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent’s motion to dismiss this action for being filed beyond the one-year limitation period (Doc. 3) is **GRANTED**, that Petitioner’s Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**, and that this action is **DISMISSED**. A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order. Finding no substantial issue for appeal concerning the denial of a constitutional right affecting the conviction, nor a debatable procedural ruling, a certificate of appealability is not issued.

This the 17th day of February, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge