

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Robert Vincent Clark v. Jamie Miller

Clark v. Miller · No. 2:24-cv-00645-YY · Decided April 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon reviews a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendation in a habeas action where no party filed objections. Finding no clear error on the face of the record, the court adopts the findings and recommendation and denies Robert Vincent Clark’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Adrienne Nelson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	April 16, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00645-YY
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought federal habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. After the magistrate judge recommended denial, no party filed objections, and the district court reviewed the findings and recommendation for clear error.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objections are filed to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation, the court reviews the findings and recommendation for clear error on the face of the record; no review is required in the absence of objections, although the district judge may review sua sponte under de novo or another standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Robert Vincent Clark v. Jamie Miller

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation when no timely objections are filed?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny the habeas petition should be adopted.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed, the district court reviews the magistrate judge's findings and recommendation for clear error on the face of the record.
2. The court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendation and denied Clark's petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A district court judge may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.””

“Because no party in this case has made objections to the F&R, the Court reviews the F&R for clear error on the face of the record.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Robert Vincent Clark's petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The magistrate judge recommended that the petition be denied, and no party objected by the deadline. The district court found no clear error in the findings and recommendation and denied the petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

United States Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued findings and a recommendation on March 3, 2026, recommending denial of the habeas petition. Objections were due March 30, 2026, but none were filed. The district court reviewed the findings and recommendation for clear error on the face of the record, found no clear error, adopted the recommendation, and denied the petition.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152-54 (1985)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 382 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)
- Decker v. Berryhill, 856 F.3d 659, 663 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Hayden v. United States, 147 F. Supp. 3d 1125, 1127 (D. Or. 2015)

OPINION

Robert Vincent Clark v. Jamie Miller

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ROBERT VINCENT CLARK, Case No.: 2:24-cv-00645-YY Petitioner, v.

ORDER

JAMIE MILLER,

Respondent. Adrienne Nelson, United States District Judge: United States Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued a findings and recommendation (“F&R”) in this habeas action on March 3, 2026, ECF 23. The F&R recommends that petitioner Robert Vincent Clark’s petition for writ of habeas corpus should be denied. *Id.* at 1. No party has filed objections, which were due by March 30, 2026. *Id.* at 13. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). A district court judge may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). No standard of review is prescribed for portions for the report for which no objections are filed, and no review is required in the absence of objections. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152-54 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 382 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). A district judge is not, however, precluded from reviewing the report sua sponte under a de novo, or any other, standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154; *Decker v. Berryhill*, 856 F.3d 659, 663 (9th Cir. 2017). Courts in this district have followed the Advisory Committee’s recommendation that, when no timely objection is filed, findings and recommendations be reviewed for “clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment; see, e.g., *Hayden v. United States*, 147 F. Supp. 3d 1125, 1127 (D. Or. 2015) (following the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviewing magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record”). Because no party in this case has made objections to the F&R, the Court reviews the F&R for clear error on the face of the record. Finding no such error, the Court ADOPTS the F&R, ECF 23. Accordingly, the petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Findings and Recommendations, ECF 23. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, ECF 1, is DENIED. Judgment shall follow. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 16th day of April, 2026. Adrienne Nelson United States District Judge