

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas

**ENTERED**

November 30, 2018

David J. Bradley, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MCALLEN DIVISION

MARIA FELIX CEDILLOS-  
ALVARENGA,

Petitioner,

VS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

MISC, ACTION NO. 7:17-MC-01465


**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pending before the Court is Petitioner Maria Felix Cedillos-Alvarenga’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which had been referred to the Magistrate Court for a report and recommendation. On October 12, 2018, the Magistrate Court issued the Report and Recommendation, recommending that Petitioner’s § 2241 habeas petition be denied, that Petitioner be denied a certificate of appealability, and that this action be dismissed. The time for filing objections has passed and no objections have been filed.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error.<sup>1</sup> Finding no clear error, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to § 2241 is **DENIED**, that Petitioner is denied a certificate of appealability, and that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DONE at McAllen, Texas, this 30th day of November, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Micaela Alvarez  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> As noted by the Fifth Circuit, “[t]he advisory committee’s note to Rule 72(b) states that, ‘[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Douglas v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note (1983)) *superseded by statute on other grounds by* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), *as stated in* ACS Recovery Servs., Inc. v. Griffin, No. 11-40446, 2012 WL 1071216, at \*7 n.5 (5th Cir. Apr. 2, 2012).