

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SHAMEK HYNSON	:	CIVIL ACTION
<i>Petitioner-pro se</i>	:	
	:	NO. 16-3836
v.	:	
	:	
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE	:	
COUNTY OF CHESTER, <i>et al.</i>	:	
<i>Respondents</i>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of February 2017, upon consideration of the pleadings and record herein, and after careful and independent consideration of the *Report and Recommendation* (“R&R”) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Timothy R. Rice, [ECF 6], to which no objections were filed,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The *Report and Recommendation* is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**.
2. Petitioner’s petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* is **DENIED**.
3. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this matter.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro  
**NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO**  
*Judge, United States District Court*

---

<sup>1</sup> Because no objections to the R&R were filed, this Court reviewed the R&R under the “plain error” standard. *See Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003). Under this plain error standard of review, an R&R should only be rejected if the magistrate judge commits an error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] ‘substantial rights,’ and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, after a thorough review of the record and the R&R, this Court finds no error and, therefore, adopts the R&R in its entirety.