

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION

MARC ELLIS NIELSEN,

No. 6:15-cv-02064-JE

Petitioner,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

JEFF PREMO,

Respondent.

MOSMAN, J.,

On July 27, 2018, Magistrate Judge John Jelderks issued his Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [58], recommending that Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [2] be DISMISSED. Petitioner objected [60] and Respondent responded [61].

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of

1 – OPINION AND ORDER

Appendix B, Page 1 of 2
Petition for Writ of Certiorari

the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

CONCLUSION

Upon review, I agree with Judge Jelderks's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [58] in full. Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [2] is DISMISSED with prejudice and I decline to issue a Certificate of Appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 9th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge