Morton v. Thomas Doc. 16

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON

KEITH ALLEN MORTON,

CV 09-53-PK

Petitioner,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

J.E. THOMAS, Warden, FCI Sheriden,

Respondent.

REDDEN, Judge:

On August 14, 2009, Magistrate Judge Paul Papak filed his Findings and Recommendation (doc. 14) that the court deny Petitioner Keith Allen Morton's <u>pro se</u> Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (doc. 2), and enter judgment dismissing this case without prejudice.

The matter is now before me. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Neither party timely filed objections. This relieves me of my obligation to review Magistrate Judge Papak's factual findings <u>de novo</u>. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); <u>Simpson v. Lear</u>
PAGE 1 - OPINION AND ORDER

<u>Astronics Corp.</u>, 77 F.3d 1170, 1174-75 (9th Cir. 1996). Having reviewed the legal principles <u>de</u> novo, I find no error.

Accordingly, I ADOPT magistrate Judge Papak's's Findings and Recommendation (doc. 14) as my own opinion. Morton's <u>pro se</u> Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (doc. 2) is DENIED, without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4th day of September, 2009.

/s/ James A. Redden
James A. Redden
United States District Judge