

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
MEDFORD DIVISION

COLE RICHARD LUSBY,

Plaintiff,

v.

**RICK ANGELOZZI, Superintendent,
Warner Creek Correctional Facility,**

Defendant.

No. 1:12-cv-01760-HU

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On May 7, 2014, Magistrate Judge Hubel issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [28] in the above-captioned case, recommending that Mr. Lusby’s petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be denied. Mr. Lusby objected [30]. Mr. Angelozzi did not file a response.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. I am not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge; instead, I retain responsibility for making the final determination. I am required to review de novo those portions of the report or any specified findings or recommendations within it to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, I am not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those

portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether objections have been filed, in either case I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Hubel's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R [28] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 20th day of June, 2014.

/s/Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Judge