

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

JAMES MICHAEL CHECKSFIELD           §  
v.   §   CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:15cv712  
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID                   §

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

The Petitioner James Checksfield, proceeding *pro se*, filed this application for the writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254 complaining of the legality of disciplinary action taken against him during his confinement in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division. This Court ordered that the matter 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.

Checksfield was convicted of the disciplinary offenses of possession of a weapon and threatening to inflict harm on an offender, receiving punishments of 45 days of commissary restriction, 30 days of cell restriction, reduction in classification status, and the loss of 30 days of good time credits. After exhausting his state remedies, he sought federal habeas corpus relief. The Respondent filed an answer, to which Checksfield filed a response.

After review of the pleadings and the state records, including an audio recording of the disciplinary hearing, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the petition for habeas corpus relief be dismissed. No objections were filed to the report; consequently, the parties are 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 proposed 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 determined 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. 13) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled application for the writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Petitioner James Checksfield is **DENIED** a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. Finally, it is

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

**So Ordered and Signed**

Jan 25, 2017



Ron Clark, United States District Judge