

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

---

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.<sup>1</sup> 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-