

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Andrew Settles v. B. Hudson, Warden

Settles · No. CV-24-00258-TUC-JAS (LCK) · Decided January 5, 2026

OPINION

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 3 4
Andrew Settles, No. CV-24-00258-TUC-JAS (LCK) 5 Petitioner, ORDER 6 Vv. 7 B. Hudson,
Warden, 8 Respondent. 9 10 Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation issued by
United States 11 || Magistrate Judge Kimmins. A review of the record reflects that the parties have
not filed ☐☐ any objections to the Report and Recommendation and the time to file objections has
13 || expired.

As such, the Court will not consider any objections or new evidence. 14 The Court has reviewed
the record and concludes that Magistrate Judge Kimmins' 15 || recommendations are not clearly
erroneous. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; 16 || Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp.,
170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999); Conley v. Crabtree, 14 17||_ F. Supp. 2d 1203, 1204 (D.

Or. 1998). 18 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows: 19 (1) Magistrate Judge
Kimmins' Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) is accepted and 20 adopted. 1 (2) The § 2241
Petition is denied and this case is dismissed with prejudice; the Clerk 22 of the Court shall enter
judgment and close the file in this case. 23 Dated this 5th day of January, 2026. 24 26 Honorable
James A. Soto 27 United States District Judge 28