

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Jason C. Redditt v. M. Gutierrez

Redditt · No. CV-25-00030-TUC-AMM · Decided April 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation recommending denial of Jason C. Redditt’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court denied the petitioner’s related motions, dismissed the matter, and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Angela M. Martinez
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	April 14, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-00030-TUC-AMM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending denial of a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and denial of several related motions. No party filed a specific objection.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For portions of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which no specific written objection is made, the district court reviews for clear error. Portions subject to a specific objection receive de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or published-status designation in the source.
PARTIES	Jason C. Redditt v. M. Gutierrez

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error because no specific written objection was filed.
2. Whether the district court should adopt the Report and Recommendation and deny the § 2241 habeas petition and related motions.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific written objection is made to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
2. The court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, denied the § 2241 petition and the related motions, and dismissed the matter.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A district court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”” (1)

“the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jason C. Redditt filed a self-represented petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. He also filed motions and declarations seeking to add evidence, support a temporary restraining order, enter default, and expand the record. The parties did not file specific objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 27, 2026, Magistrate Judge Bruce G. Macdonald issued a Report and Recommendation recommending denial of the § 2241 petition and related motions. The parties were given fourteen days to object, but neither filed a specific objection. The district court reviewed the R&R for clear error, adopted it, denied the petition and motions, dismissed the matter, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)
- Prior v. Ryan, CV 10-225-TUC-RCC, 2012 WL 1344286, at *1 (D. Ariz. Apr. 18, 2012)

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)

OPINION

Redditt

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 9 Jason C Redditt, No. CV-25-00030-TUC-AMM 10 Petitioner, ORDER 11 v. 12 M. Gutierrez,
13 Respondent. 14 15 On March 27, 2026, Magistrate Judge Bruce G. Macdonald issued a Report
and 16 Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending this Court deny self-represented Petitioner 17
Jason C. Redditt’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. (Doc. 29.) Judge 18
Macdonald also recommends the Court deny Petitioner’s Motion to Add Petitioner’s 19
Declaration, Declaration in Support of Temporary Restraining Order, Declaration for Entry 20 of
Default, and Motion to Expand Record. (Id.) Judge Macdonald notified the parties they 21 had
fourteen (14) days to file any written objections to the proposed findings and 22 recommendations.
(Id. at 17.) Neither party filed an objection, and the time to do so has 23 now passed.1 24 A district
court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is 25 1 On April 6, 2026,
Petitioner filed a “Declaration of Marcus Jones.” (Doc. 30.) Because the Declaration does not
address or specifically object to the R&R, the Court will review 26 the R&R for clear error. See
United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (the Court reviews de
novo those portions of the R&R to which specific 27 objection is made); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2)
(requiring objections be “specific [and] written”); see also Prior v. Ryan, CV 10-225-TUC-RCC,
2012 WL 1344286, at *1 (D. 28 Ariz. Apr. 18, 2012) (the Court reviews portions of the R&R that
are not objected to for clear error). 1 || not the subject of an objection.” Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S.
140, 149 (1985); see also 28 2|| U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“A judge of the court shall make a de novo
determination of those || portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations
to which objection is made.”). “[T]he court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on
the || face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory 6 ||
Committee Notes 1983 Addition. A district judge may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole || or in
part, the findings or recommendations” of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 8 The
Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s R&R (Doc. 29), the parties’ briefs 9|| (Docs. 1, 16),
Petitioner’s motions (Docs. 21, 25—26, 28), and the record. The Court finds no clear error and
agrees with the findings and recommendation. 11 Accordingly, 12 IT IS ORDERED that the
Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED. (Doc. 29.) 13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that
Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is DENIED. (Doc. 1.) 15
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner’s “Motion to Add Petitioner’s 16|| Declaration” is
DENIED. (Doc. 21.) 17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion to Add Declaration

in 18 || Support of Temporary Restraining Order is DENIED. (Doc. 25.) 19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's "Declaration for Entry of Default" is DENIED. (Doc. 26.) 21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion to Expand Record is || DENIED. (Doc. 28.) 23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this matter is DISMISSED. The Clerk of Court 24 || shall docket accordingly, term any pending motions, and close this case. 25 Dated this 14th day of April, 2026. \ 26 be Wi 27 Honorable Angela M. Martinez 38 United States District Judge -2-