

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Joshua Junker v. Pamela Bondi, et al.

Junker · No. CV-25-01471-PHX-DLR (DMF) · Decided March 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona reviewed and accepted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Joshua Junker’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The court denied and dismissed the petition without prejudice and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and terminate the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	March 19, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-01471-PHX-DLR (DMF)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending denial and dismissal without prejudice of Petitioner's habeas corpus petition. No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court is relieved of its obligation to conduct review; the court nevertheless reviewed and accepted the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Joshua Junker v. Pamela Bondi, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- habeas corpus
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should accept the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when neither party filed a timely objection.
2. Whether the habeas corpus petition should be denied and dismissed without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party files a timely objection to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court is relieved of its obligation to review the recommendation, although it may review the recommendation notwithstanding the absence of objections.
2. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied and dismissed without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Neither party filed objections, which relieves the Court of its obligation to review the R&R.” (at 1)

“The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and finds that it is well-taken. The Court will accept the R&R in its entirety.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Joshua Junker filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The opinion contains no substantive facts underlying the petition because the district court resolved the matter by accepting the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after no objections were filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The magistrate judge recommended that the petition be denied and dismissed without prejudice, and advised the parties of the fourteen-day objection period. Neither party objected. The district court reviewed and accepted the Report and Recommendation and ordered the petition denied and dismissed without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)

OPINION

Junker

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 9 Joshua Junker, No. CV-25-01471-PHX-DLR (DMF) 10 Petitioner, ORDER 11 v. 12 Pamela
Bondi, et al., 13 Respondents. 14 15 Before the Court is Petitioner Joshua Junker’s Petition for
Writ of Habeas Corpus 16 (Doc. 2) and United States Magistrate Judge Deborah M. Fine’s Report
and 17 Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 17). The R&R recommends that the Court deny and 18
dismiss the petition without prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they 19 had
fourteen days to file objections to the R&R and that failure to file timely objections 20 could be
considered a waiver of the right to obtain review of the R&R. See United States 21 v. Reyna-
Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). Neither party filed objections, which 22 relieves the
Court of its obligation to review the R&R. See Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d at 1121; 23 Thomas v. Arn,
474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (“[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any 24 review at all . . . of any
issue that is not the subject of an objection.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 25 72(b)(3) (“The district judge must
determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s 26 disposition that has been properly
objected to.”). The Court has nonetheless reviewed the 27 R&R and finds that it is well-taken. The
Court will accept the R&R in its entirety. See 28 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the district
court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole 1 || or in part, the findings or recommendations
made by the magistrate”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 2|| 72(b)(3) (“The district judge may accept, reject, or
modify the recommended disposition; 3 || receive further evidence; or return the matter to the
magistrate judge with instructions.”). 4 IT IS ORDERED that the R&R (Doc. 17) is ACCEPTED.
5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Petitioner’s petition (Doc. 2) is DENIED and 6|| DISMISSED
WITHOUT PREJUDICE. 7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing the Clerk of the Court to enter
judgment 8 || accordingly and terminate this case. 9 Dated this 18th day of March, 2026. 10 11 12
{Z, 14 Sone United States District Judge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 -2-