

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

MICHAEL GRANT,	)	CASE NO. 1:21CV1156
	)	
Petitioner,	)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u></b>
	)	<b><u>AND ORDER</u></b>
WARDEN RONALD ERDOS,	)	[Resolving ECF Nos. <a href="#">10</a> , <a href="#">11</a> and
	)	Regarding <a href="#">ECF No. 14</a> ]
Respondent.	)	

On August 18, 2022, the assigned Magistrate Judge Darrell A. Clay issued a Report and Recommendation denying Petitioner's request for habeas relief pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 2254](#) as time-barred ([ECF No. 14](#)) and denying Petitioner's Motion to Suppress Evidence ([ECF No. 10](#)) as moot.<sup>1</sup>

[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. In the instant case, objections to the Report and Recommendation were due by September 1, 2022. Neither party has filed objections, evidencing satisfaction with the magistrate judge's recommendations. Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. [Thomas v. Arn](#), 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); [Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services](#), 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); [United States v. Walters](#), 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Report and Recommendation does not explicitly resolve the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss ([ECF No. 11](#)), it is clear from the writing that this motion must also be denied as moot.

(1:21CV1156)

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge is hereby adopted. ([ECF No. 14](#)). Petitioner's writ of habeas corpus Petition is dismissed, Petitioner's Motion to Suppress Evidence ([ECF No. 10](#)) is denied as moot, and Respondent's Motion to Dismiss ([ECF No. 11](#)) is also denied as moot.

Additionally, as provided in the Report and Recommendation, the Court certifies, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(a\)\(3\)](#), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)](#); [Fed R. App. P. 22\(b\)](#).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 9, 2022  
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson  
Benita Y. Pearson  
United States District Judge