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

THOMAS EDWARD GROVE *Petitioner-pro se*	:	**CIVIL ACTION** **NO. 16-5154**
v.	:	
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, *et al* *Respondents*	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 10th day of July 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 Lynne A. Sitarski, [ECF 8], to which no objections were filed,[1] 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

[1] 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.