

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, LOUISVILLE DIVISION

**Marcel Rivero Perez v. Supervisory Detention and Deportation
Officer, Robert Guardian, and Terri Robinson**

Perez · No. 3:24-cv-735-RGJ-LLK · Decided February 24, 2026

OPINION

Perez

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
LOUISVILLE DIVISION

MARCEL RIVERO PEREZ, Petitioner v. Civil Action No. 3:24-cv-735-RGJ-LLK
SUPERVISORY DETENTION AND Defendants
DEPORTATION OFFICER,
ROBERT GUADIAN, and TERRI
ROBINSON

* * * * *

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus & Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief (“Amended Petition”) filed by Petitioner Marcel Rivero Perez (“Perez”) challenging the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) Form I-220B Order of Supervision and associated conditions. [DE 11]. Respondents filed a Motion to Dismiss Petitioner’s Amended Petitioner [DE 14], Petitioner filed a response [DE 15], and Respondents filed a reply [DE 16]. This matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Lanny King for report and recommendation. [DE 17, DE 18]. Judge King entered his Report and Recommendation [DE 21] on February 3, 2026, recommending that the motion to dismiss be granted. The time for objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendation expired on February 17, 2026. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Perez did not file objections and the time for doing so has passed. This matter is now ripe for adjudication. A district court may refer a motion to a magistrate judge for the preparation of a report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). “A magistrate judge must promptly conduct the required proceedings . . . [and] enter a recommended disposition, including, if appropriate, proposed findings of fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). This Court must “determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The Court need not review under a de novo or any other standard those aspects of

the report and recommendation to which no specific objection is made and may adopt the findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150, 155 (1985). Here, because no party has objected to the Report and Recommendation, the Court may accept it without review. See *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 150, 155. Nevertheless, the Court has conducted its own review of the record and finds no error in the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions. Accordingly, and the Court being otherwise sufficiently advised, IT ORDERED as follows:

(1) The Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge Lanny King, [DE 21], is ACCEPTED in whole and INCORPORATED by reference.

(2) A separate judgment shall issue this date.

United States District Court February 24, 2026 ce: Counsel of Record