Putnam v. Director TDCJ - CID Doc. 20

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

ROBERT C. PUTNAM	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:13cv326
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	8	

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Robert Putnam, proceeding *pro se*, filed this application for the writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254 complaining of the legality of his confinement. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

Putnam has filed a motion asking that his petition be dismissed, and the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this motion be granted. Putnam received a copy of this Report on or before August 2, 2013, but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has concluded that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. <u>18</u>) is hereby ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Petitioner's motion for voluntary dismissal (docket no. <u>17</u>) is GRANTED and the above-styled application for the writ of habeas corpus be and hereby is DISMISSED without prejudice on the motion of the Petitioner. It is further

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby DENIED.

It is SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 19th day of September, 2013.

MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE