

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DIVISION**

Alicia Wright v. E. Ricolcol

No. 5:24-cv-01863-FWS (AS), United States District Court for the Central District of California, Eastern
Division (July 3, 2025)

OPINION

Alicia Wright v. E. Ricolcol

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – EASTERN DIVISION

10 Case No. 5:24-cv-01863-FWS (AS) 11

12 ALICIA WRIGHT, ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS,

CONCLUSIONS AND

13 Petitioner, RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED

14 STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE [22]

15 v. AND OVERRULING OBJECTIONS

[23]

16

E. RICOLCOL, WARDEN

17 VICTORVILLE,

18 Defendant. 19

20 21 I. Introduction and Relevant Procedural History 22 Before the court is the Magistrate
Judge’s June 3, 2025, Report and 23 Recommendation. (Dkt. 22 (“Report and Recommendation”
or “R&R”).) Based on 24 the state of the record, as applied to the applicable law, the court
ADOPTS the Report 25 and Recommendation issued by the Magistrate Judge, including each of
the findings 26 of fact and conclusions of law therein. 27 28 1 In summary, on August 2, 2024,
Petitioner Joseph Robert Ward (“Plaintiff”) filed 2 a Petition for a Writ Of Habeas Corpus under
28 U.S.C § 2241. (Dkt. 1 (“Petition”).) 3 On December 6, 2024, Respondent E. Ricolcol, Warden
of the Satellite Prison Camp in 4 Victorville, California, of the Federal Bureau of Prisons
(“Respondent”), filed a 5 Motion to Dismiss the Petition. (Dkt. 15 (“Motion to Dismiss”).) On
January 13, 6 2025, Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. 18 7
(“Opposition”).) On June 3, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report and 8 Recommendation.
(Dkt. 22) On June 20, 2025, Petitioner objected to the Report and 9 Recommendation. (Dkt. 23
(“Objections”).) 10 II. Discussion 11 “A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole
or in part, the 12 findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. 13 §

636(b)(1)(C); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (stating “[t]he district judge must 14 determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been 15 properly objected to,” and “[t]he district judge may accept, reject, or modify the 16 recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the 17 magistrate judge with instructions”). Proper objections require “specific written 18 objections to the proposed findings and recommendations” of the magistrate judge. 19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). “A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of 20 those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to 21 which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (“The statute makes it clear that the 23 district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de 24 novo if objection is made, but not otherwise.”). Where no objection has been made, 25 arguments challenging a finding are deemed waived. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) 26 (“Within fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file 27 written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by 28 rules of court.”). Moreover, “[o]bjections to a R&R are not a vehicle to relitigate the 1 same arguments carefully considered and rejected by the Magistrate Judge.” *Chith v. 2 Haynes*, 2021 WL 4744596, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 12, 2021). 3 In the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommended that 4 the court issue an order: 5

(1) accepting this Report and Recommendation, (2) granting

6 Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 15), and (3) directing that Judgment be entered dismissing this action without prejudice. 7 8 (Report and Recommendation at 33.) 9 In the Objections, Petitioner states the following: 10 11 Petitioner Wright respectfully objects to the Magistrate Judge’s denial because the denial is based on a deficient understanding of the claim. The Magistrate 12 Judge did not address the claim in its entirety. The claim states that the BOP 13 policy of making a medium pattern scored inmate wait three years before a transition to a lower scored pattern score is not “meaningful” because it 14 truncates other programs that reduces the length of an inmates sentence (i.e. 15 RDAP). The BOP’s policy of making an inmate wait a designated time period is in direct conflict with the First Step Act. 16 (Objections at 1.) 17 After conducting a de novo review of the Objections, the court agrees with each 18 of the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Report and 19 Recommendation, including each of the recommendations contained therein. 20 Accordingly, Petitioner’s arguments set forth in the Objections are OVERRULED on 21 the merits. 22 In sum, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the court has reviewed the record, 23 including the Report and Recommendation, the Petition, the Motion to Dismiss, the 24 Opposition, the Objections and the other records of the case. After conducting a de 25 novo review of the Objections, the court concurs with and accepts the findings and 26 conclusions of the Magistrate Judge in the Report and Recommendation. 27 /// 28 1 II. Conclusion 2 Based on the state of the record, as applied to the applicable law, the court 3 | adopts the Report and Recommendation and accepts each of the findings of fact and 4 | conclusions of law therein.

Accordingly, the court ORDERS the following: 5 6 (1) The Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED. 7
(2) The Petition is DENIED, and the court will enter Judgment 8 DISMISSING THIS ACTION
WITHOUT PREJUDICE. 9 (3) The Clerk shall serve copies of this Order, the Report and 10
Recommendation and the Judgment on Petitioner and counsel for 11 Respondent. 12 13 LET
JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY. 14 15 16 Lo LS /—— 17 | Dated: July 3, 2025
Hon. Fred W. Slaughter
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28