

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**CHARLES MILLER,**

CASE NO. 1:22 CV 1758

Petitioner,

v.

JUDGE JAMES R. KNEPP II

**WARDEN LEON HILL,**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER**

Respondent.

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") to dismiss in part and deny in part Petitioner Charles Miller's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. 10). Specifically, Judge Parker recommends Ground One be dismissed in part as non-cognizable to the extent it raises a state statutory claim and denied in part as meritless; Ground Two be dismissed in part as non-cognizable and denied in part as meritless; Ground Three be dismissed as non-cognizable; Grounds Four and Five be denied as meritless; and Ground Six be dismissed as non-cognizable or alternatively denied as meritless. *See id.* at 15-41. Judge Parker further recommends the Court deny a certificate of appealability. *Id.* at 41-42.

Under the relevant statute:

Within fourteen days of being served with a copy [of a Magistrate Judge's R&R], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file timely written objections to a Magistrate Judge's R&R constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review by the district court

of any issues covered in the R&R. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 814-15 (6th Cir. 1984); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

In this case, the R&R was issued on November 22, 2023, and it is now January 4, 2024. Petitioner has neither filed objections nor requested an extension of time to file them. Despite the lack of objections, the Court has reviewed Judge Parker's R&R, and agrees with the findings and recommended rulings therein. Therefore, the Court ADOPTS Judge Parker's R&R (Doc. 10) as the Order of this Court, and DENIES and DISMISSES Petitioner's Petition (Doc. 1) as set forth therein.

The Court finds an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). Further, because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right directly related to his conviction or custody, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); FED. R. APP. P. 22(b); Rule 11 of Rules Governing § 2254 Cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

*s/ James R. Knepp II*  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE