

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BERNARD K. REED,
Petitioner,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Respondent.

No. 2:24-cv-3524-TLN-JDP (P)

ORDER

Petitioner Bernard K. Reed (“Petitioner”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On September 9, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations which were served on Petitioner and which contained notice that any objections were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. (ECF No. 9.) This deadline has passed, and no objections have been filed.

The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court[.]”). Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed September 9, 2025, (ECF No. 9), are ADOPTED in full;
2. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders for the reasons set forth in the April 28, 2025, order;
3. The Court DECLINES to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C. § 2253; and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case and to enter judgment accordingly.

Date: October 23, 2025



TROY L. NUNLEY
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE