

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BAKHARI JVONNE THOMAS,

Petitioner,

v.

No. 2:17-cv-04066

THERESA DELBALSO;
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE
COUNTY OF CHESTER; and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Respondents.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 16th day of January, 2018, upon consideration¹ of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, ECF No. 1; the Response to the Petition, ECF No. 5; and the Report and Recommendation (R&R) of United States Magistrate Judge Carol Sandra Moore Wells, ECF No.

6, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

¹ When neither party objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court is not statutorily required to review the report, under de novo or any other standard. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985). Nevertheless, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has held that it is better practice to afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report. *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987), *writ denied* 484 U.S. 837 (1987). “When no objections are filed, the district court need only review the record for plain error or manifest injustice.” *Harper v. Sullivan*, No. 89-4272, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2168, at *2 n.3 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 22, 1991). *See also Hill v. Barnacle*, No. 15-3815, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 12370, at *16-17 (3d Cir. 2016) (holding that even when objections are filed, district courts “are not required to make any separate findings or conclusions when reviewing a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)”); *Oldrati v. Apfel*, 33 F. Supp. 2d 397, 399 (E.D. Pa. 1998) (explaining that in the absence of a timely objection, the court should review the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation for clear error). The district court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

1. The Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 6, is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**.
2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus, ECF No. 1, is **DISMISSED WITH**

PREJUDICE.

3. This case is **CLOSED**.
4. There is no basis for the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.
United States District Judge