

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Jordan Adam Sutherland v. Corey Fhuere

Sutherland · No. 6:24-cv-01706-JR · Decided March 18, 2026

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON JORDAN ADAM SUTHERLAND, Case No. 6:24-cv-01706-JR Petitioner, ORDER v. COREY FHUERE, Respondent. BAGGIO, District Judge: 1 Defendant's name appears with various spellings. "Fhuere" appears on the CM/ECF docket, based on Petitioner's Petition. ECF No. 2. "Fheure" appears in the caption of Judge Russo's Findings and Recommendation ("F&R").

In the body of the F&R, Judge Russo cites one of Petitioner's state cases at the intermediate appellate court correctly as Sutherland v. Fhuere, 332 Or. App. 589 (2024) and the same case at the state high court incorrectly as Sutherland v. Fheure, 372 Or. 720 (2024). Indeed, the state courts consistently use "Fhuere." See generally Resp't's Exs. 101–124, ECF No. 21 ("Fheure" not appearing in state court record).

In yet another variation, "Fhure" appears in the caption of Respondent's filings. E.g. Resp't's Answer, ECF No. 20. This Court relies on the docket and uses "Fhuere" accordingly. Magistrate Judge Russo issued a Findings and Recommendation on December 4, 2025, in which she recommends that the Court deny Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Motion for Discovery.

F&R, ECF No. 33. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Because no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation were timely filed, the Court is relieved of its obligation to review the record de novo. *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding de novo review required only for portions of Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been made).

Having reviewed the legal principles de novo, the Court finds no error. CONCLUSION The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Russo's Findings and Recommendation [33]. Accordingly, Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [2] and Motion for Discovery [26] are DENIED.

Because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, the Court DENIES the issuance of a Certificate of Appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 18th day of March, 2026. Ang. Mo. Faggee Ga meee — United States District Judge 2 — ORDER

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon/2026/jordan-adam-sutherland-v-corey-fhuere-mx5fuzw0>