

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Michael Caruthers v. Superintendent Uhler

23-CV-1124 (JLS) (JJM) · No. 23-CV-1124 (JLS) (JJM) · Decided June 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of New York adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation recommending denial of Michael Caruthers’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court found no objections had been filed, denied the petition, and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John L. Sinatra, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
DECIDED	June 16, 2026
DOCKET	23-CV-1124 (JLS) (JJM)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought federal habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. After a magistrate judge recommended denial in a Report and Recommendation, neither party objected, and the district court adopted the recommendation and denied the petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts de novo review of portions of a magistrate judge’s recommendation to which a party objects. When no objections are filed, neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires review of the recommendation, although the court may review and adopt it.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court decision
PARTIES	Michael Caruthers v. Superintendent Uhler

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal habeas corpus

Magistrate judge recommendations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could accept and adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation without conducting de novo review when neither party filed objections.
2. Whether the petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be denied for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 do not require the district court to review the recommendation before adopting it.
2. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised.”

“Accordingly, for the reasons in the R&R, the [1] Petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DENIED.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed by Michael Caruthers under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The district court considered a magistrate judge's recommendation that the petition be denied. Neither party filed objections before the objection period expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2254 habeas petition. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy, who issued a Report and Recommendation on May 20, 2026, recommending denial. With no objections filed, the district court accepted and adopted the recommendation, denied the petition, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985)

OPINION

Caruthers
PER CURIAM.
SINES DISTRICT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
JUN 16 2026
MICHAEL CARUTHERS,
W DISTRICT
Petitioner,
v. 23-CV-1124 (JLS) (JJM)
SUPERINTENDENT UHLER,
Respondent.
DECISION AND ORDER

Pro se Petitioner commenced this action on October 25, 2028, by filing a petition seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. See Dkt. 1. The case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy for all proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A), (B), and (C). Dkt. 16. On May 20, 2026, Judge McCarthy issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R) recommending that the Petition be denied. Dkt. 17. Neither party filed objections, and the time to do so has expired. See *id.* A district court may accept, reject, or modify the findings or recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(8). A district court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation to which a party objects. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(8). But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985). This Court carefully reviewed the R&R and, based on that review, and in the absence of any objections, the Court accepts and adopts Judge McCarthy's recommendation. Accordingly, for the reasons in the R&R, the [1] Petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. SO ORDERED. Dated: June 16, 2026 Buffalo, New York
NI/ SINATRA, JR. _~
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE