

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>RESPONDENT</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CRIMINAL No. 01-34-P-H</b>
	)	<b>(CIVIL No. 03-13-P-H)</b>
<b>WILLIAM L. PAUL,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>PETITIONER</b>	)	

**AMENDED ORDER AFFIRMING RECOMMENDED DECISION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On May 22, 2003, I affirmed the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision denying the prisoner petitioner's motion for 28 U.S.C. § 2255 relief because no objection had been timely filed. Any objection was due by May 16, 2003. The petitioner's objection was filed and docketed on May 22, 2001, but the notarized signature of the was dated May 15, 2003. For the benefit of the petitioner, I will assume that May 15 was the date the objection was deposited in the prison mail system and that it was therefore timely filed. I therefore **VACATE** my previous order affirming the Recommended Decision without objection.

I have now examined the petitioner's objections to the Recommended Decision; I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth

in the Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED**. The petitioner's motion for 28 U.S.C. § 2255 relief is **DENIED** without an evidentiary hearing.

Finally, I also find at this time that no certificate of appealability should issue because there is no substantial issue that could be presented on appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); First Circuit Interim Local Rule 22.1.

**SO ORDERED.**

**DATED THIS 23RD DAY OF MAY, 2003.**

---

**D. BROCK HORNBY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**