

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION**

Raheem Mark Miller v. Director, TDCJ-CID

Miller v. Director, TDCJ-CID · No. 6:25-cv-507-JDK-KNM · Decided March 18, 2026

OPINION

Raheem Mark Miller v. Director, TDCJ-CID

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

RAHEEM MARK MILLER, §

#02091262, § § Petitioner, § § v. § Case No. 6:25-cv-507-JDK-KNM §

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID, §

§ Respondent. §

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Petitioner Raheem Mark Miller, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition. On February 17, 2026, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the petition be dismissed with prejudice as barred by the applicable statute of limitations, and that a certificate of appealability be denied. Docket No. 9. A copy of this Report was sent to Petitioner, who has not filed written objections. This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Petitioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”). Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions

contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 9) as the findings of this Court. This petition for habeas corpus is hereby DENIED and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 18th day of March, 2026.

JHREMYJD. KERN DLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE