

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 DALLAS DIVISION

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| JOSHUA CORNELL SKINNER, | § | |
| ID # 2137079 | § | |
| <i>Petitioner,</i> | § | |
| | § | |
| v. | § | |
| | § | No. 3:21-CV-1246-X-BH |
| DIRECTOR, Texas Department of | § | |
| Criminal Justice, Correctional | § | |
| Institutions Division, | § | |
| | § | |
| <i>Respondent.</i> | § | |

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
 RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. [Doc. No. 41]. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Skinner’s Motion to Stay [Doc. No. 40] should be denied “[b]ecause [Skinner] has not shown that he is entitled to a stay and abeyance under the standard set forth in *Rhines*.”¹ Skinner filed objections. [Doc. No. 42]. First, he claims that the “*Rhines* standard does not apply.”² But Skinner himself applies the *Rhines* standard, so he doesn’t adequately explain that objection. Second, Skinner styles his claim as a “dead-bang winner.”³ But Skinner merely regurgitates the same

¹ Doc. No. 41 at 4.

² Doc. No. 42 at 1 (emphasis added).

³ *Id.* at 3.

argument the Magistrate Judge rejected, and Skinner does not quibble with the Magistrate Judge's reasoning.

The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Court **DENIES** Skinner's Motion to Stay.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 5th day of October 2022.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brantley Starr", written over a horizontal line.

BRANTLEY STARR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE