

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Qusai Mahasin v. Warden, USP Atwater

No. 1:25-cv-00363 JLT EPG (HC), United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (December
11, 2025)

OPINION

Qusai Mahasin v. Warden, USP Atwater

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 QUSAI MAHASIN, No. 1:25-cv-00363 JLT EPG (HC)

12 Petitioner, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING

13 v. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS

CORPUS, TERMINATING RESPONDENT’S

14 WARDEN, USP ATWATER, MOTION TO DISMISS, AND DIRECTING

CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE CASE

15 Respondent. (Docs. 8, 10) 16 17 Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a
petition for writ of habeas corpus 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. This matter was referred to a
United States Magistrate Judge 19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20
On October 3, 2025, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations 21 recommending
that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied and Respondent’s motion to 22 dismiss be
terminated.¹ (Doc. 10.) The Court served the findings and recommendations on 23 Petitioner and
notified him that any objections were due within 30 days. (Id. at 9.) The Court 24 advised him that
the “failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to 25 appeal the
District Court’s order.” (Id. at 10, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 26 (9th Cir.
2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 27 1 The magistrate
judge noted that “[a]lthough the responsive pleading is titled as a ‘motion to dismiss and
response,’ Respondent only addresses the merits of the petition and does not provide grounds for
dismissal, as opposed to 28 denial, of the petition.” (Doc. 10 at 2 n.2.) 1 According to 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1)(C), this Court performed a de novo review of this 2 | case. Having carefully reviewed
the matter, the Court concludes the findings and 3 || recommendations are supported by the record
and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 4 1. The findings and recommendations issued on
October 3, 2025 (Doc. 10) are 5 ADOPTED IN FULL. 6 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus

is DENIED. 7 3. Respondent's motion to dismiss (Doc. 8) is TERMINATED. 8 4. The Clerk of
Court is directed to CLOSE THE CASE. 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 | Dated: December 11,
2025 Cerin | Tower
TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/qusai-mahasin-v-warden-usp-atwater-z0c9r6uo>