

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

**Gavaughn Streeter v. Multnomah County**

Streeter · No. 3:25-cv-01806-JE · Decided February 23, 2026

---

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon adopts a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation in full. The court dismisses with prejudice Gavaughn Streeter's petition for a writ of habeas corpus and declines to issue a Certificate of Appealability.

OPINION

Streeter

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

GAVAUGHN STREETER, Case No. 3:25-cv-01806-JE Petitioner, ORDER ADOPTING  
FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATION

v.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY,

Respondent. IMMERGUT, District Judge. On January 21, 2025, Magistrate Judge Jelderks issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 4. The F&R recommends that this Court dismiss the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, ECF 1, and decline to issue a Certificate of Appealability on the basis that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). No objections have been filed. Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “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.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, sua sponte” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. This Court ADOPTS Judge Jelderks’ F&R, ECF 4, in full. This Court DISMISSES with prejudice the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, ECF 1, and DECLINES to issue a Certificate of Appealability because Petitioner has not made “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28

U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 23rd day of February, 2026. /s/ Karin J. Immergut Karin J. Immergut United States District Judge

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/gavaughn-streeter-v-multnomah-county-mm7iwbdg>