

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

William Samuel Schmidt v. Dean Mason

No. C25-5021JLR (W.D. Wash. Dec. 30, 2025) · No. C25-5021JLR · Decided December 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning William Samuel Schmidt’s federal habeas corpus petition. The court held that the petition was barred by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act’s one-year statute of limitations, overruled Schmidt’s objections, and dismissed the petition with prejudice. The court also denied a certificate of appealability and directed the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James L. Robart
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 30, 2025
DOCKET	C25-5021JLR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending denial of a state prisoner's federal habeas petition and considered the petitioner's objections de novo.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts a de novo determination of portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objection is made under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Pro se pleadings and objections are construed liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	William Samuel Schmidt v. Dean Mason

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- statute of limitations
- pleadings
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation that Schmidt's federal habeas petition was barred by AEDPA's one-year statute of limitations should be adopted.
2. Whether Schmidt was entitled to a federal evidentiary hearing based on his assertion that the state court had not provided a full and fair review.
3. Whether a certificate of appealability should issue.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court overruled Schmidt's objections and adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation in its entirety.
2. The petition was barred by AEDPA's one-year statute of limitations and was dismissed with prejudice.
3. The court denied Schmidt's request for an evidentiary hearing and denied a certificate of appealability.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Being fully advised, the court ADOPTS the report and recommendation, DISMISSES Mr. Schmidt's habeas petition, and DENIES a certificate of appealability." (1)

"The court has carefully considered Mr. Schmidt's objections and has reviewed Magistrate Judge Fricke's report and recommendation de novo in light of those objections." (2)

"Mr. Schmidt's petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED with prejudice." (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Schmidt challenged his January 26, 2018 conviction and sentence on four counts of child molestation in the first degree. He filed his federal habeas petition on January 9, 2025. The magistrate judge concluded that the petition was barred by AEDPA's one-year statute of limitations, and Schmidt objected that the state court had not provided a full and fair review requiring a federal evidentiary hearing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Schmidt filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on January 9, 2025, challenging his 2018 conviction and sentence for four counts of first-degree child molestation. Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke recommended that the petition be denied as barred by AEDPA's one-year statute of limitations, that an evidentiary hearing be denied, and that a certificate of appealability be denied. The district court overruled Schmidt's objections, adopted the report and recommendation in full, dismissed the petition with prejudice, denied a certificate of appealability, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bernhardt v. Los Angeles County, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir.)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE 9 10 WILLIAM SAMUEL SCHMIDT, CASE NO. C25-5021JLR 11 Petitioner,
ORDER v. 12 DEAN MASON, 13 Respondent. 14 15 I. INTRODUCTION 16 Before the court
are United States Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke's report and 17 recommendation
recommending denial of Petitioner William Samuel Schmidt's petition 18 for writ of habeas
corpus (R&R (Dkt. # 21); Petition (Dkt. # 5)), and Mr. Schmidt's 19 objections thereto (Objections
(Dkt. # 22)).

The court has considered Magistrate Judge 20 Fricke's report and recommendation, Mr. Schmidt's
objections, the relevant portions of 21 the record, and the governing law. Being fully advised, the
court ADOPTS the report and 22 1 recommendation, DISMISSES Mr. Schmidt's habeas petition,
and DENIES a certificate 2 of appealability. 3 II. BACKGROUND 4 Because Mr. Schmidt has not
objected to the report and recommendation's 5 discussion of the factual and procedural
background of this matter, the court adopts that 6 discussion in its entirety.

(R&R at 1-3; see generally Objections.) 7 Mr. Schmidt filed the instant petition for writ of habeas
corpus on January 9, 2025. 8 (See IFP Mot. (Dkt. # 1).) He challenges his January 26, 2018
conviction and sentence 9 on four counts of child molestation in the first degree. (See generally
Petition; see R&R 10 at 1-2 (citing the state court record).) Magistrate Judge Fricke recommends
that the court 11 (1) find that Mr. Schmidt's habeas petition is barred by the one-year statute of
limitations 12 established by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996
("AEDPA"), 13 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A); (2) deny Mr. Schmidt's request for an evidentiary
hearing; 14 and (3) deny a certificate of appealability.

(See generally R&R.) 15 Mr. Schmidt's objections to the report and recommendation state, in their
entirety: 16 The petitioner "OBJECTS" to the State's Report and Recommendations: 17 a.
Certificate of Appealability should be denied and; 18 b. The petitioner's federal habeas corpus
petition should be denied; for the same aforementioned reasons stated about in addition the [] fact
19 the state is not entitled to AEDPA deference because the state failed to provide a "full and fair"
review in the state court thus triggering a 20 mandatory federal evidentiary hearing in the district
court.

See: Rule 8. 21 (Objections.) Respondents did not respond to Mr. Schmidt's objections. (See
generally 22 Dkt.) 1 III. ANALYSIS 2 A district court has jurisdiction to review a magistrate
judge's report and 3 recommendation on dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The district court “shall 4 make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed 5 findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). “A 6 judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or 7 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” Id. Because Mr. Schmidt is 8 proceeding pro se, the court must interpret his petition and objections liberally.

See 9 *Bernhardt v. Los Angeles Cnty.*, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2003). 10 The court has carefully considered Mr. Schmidt’s objections and has reviewed 11 Magistrate Judge Fricke’s report and recommendation de novo in light of those 12 objections.

Having done so, the court agrees with Magistrate Judge Fricke’s 13 recommendations for the reasons set forth in the report and recommendation. 14 Accordingly, the court overrules Mr. Schmidt’s objections and adopts the report and 15 recommendation in its entirety. 16 IV. CONCLUSION 17 For the foregoing reasons, the court OVERRULES Mr. Schmidt’s objections (Dkt.

18 # 22) and ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Fricke’s report and recommendation (Dkt. # 21) in 19 its entirety. Mr. Schmidt’s petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED with 20 prejudice. A certificate of appealability is DENIED for the reasons set forth in 21 // 22 // 1 Magistrate Judge Fricke’s report and recommendation.

The Clerk is DIRECTED to close 2 this case. 3 Dated this 30th day of December, 2025. 4 A 5 6 JAMES L. ROBART United States District Judge 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22