

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Walter A.T. v. Facility Administrator, Golden State Annex

Walter A.T. · No. 1:24-cv-01513-KES-EPG (HC) · Decided September 12, 2025

OPINION

(HC)Tobar

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 WALTER A.T.,1 No. 1:24-cv-01513-KES-EPG (HC)

12 Petitioner, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING

13 v. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS

CORPUS AS MOOT, TERMINATING

14 FACILITY ADMINISTRATOR, RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO DISMISS,

GOLDEN STATE ANNEX, AND DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO

15 CLOSE CASE

Respondent.

16 Docs. 16, 21

17 Petitioner is proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 18
U.S.C. § 2241. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 19
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On July 18, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge
issued findings and recommendations that 21 recommended dismissing the petition as moot and
terminating respondent’s motion to dismiss 22 because petitioner was removed from the United
States while this case was pending. Doc. 21. 23 The findings and recommendations were served
on respondent and noted that any objections were 24 to be filed within fourteen days. The Court
also attempted to serve the findings and 25 1 The Court partially redacts petitioner’s name to
mitigate privacy concerns, as requested by 26 petitioner and recommended by the Committee on
Court Administration and Case Management 27 of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
See Memorandum Re: Privacy Concern Regarding Social Security & Immigration Opinions (May
1, 2018), 28 https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/18-cv-l-suggestion_cacm_0.pdf. 1 ||
recommendations on petitioner by mail, but the mail was returned as undeliverable. No 2 |
objections were filed. 3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has

conducted a de 4 | novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court holds the findings 5 | and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. 6 In the event a notice of appeal is filed, a certificate of appealability will not be required 7 | because this is an order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, 8 | nota final order in a habeas proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of 9 | process issued by a state court. *Forde v. U.S. Parole Commission*, 114 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 1997); 10 | see *Ojo v. INS*, 106 F.3d 680, 681-82 (Sth Cir. 1997); *Bradshaw v. Story*, 86 F.3d 164, 166 (10th 11 | Cir. 1996). 12 Accordingly: 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 18, 2025, Doc. 21, are ADOPTED 14 in full; 15 2. Respondent's motion to dismiss, Doc. 16, is TERMINATED; 16 3. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED as moot; and 17 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 18 19

29 | IT IS SO ORDERED. _

21 Dated: _ September 12, 2025 4A .

0 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23 24 25 26 27 28