

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

ALISON PAIGE HILL,

Petitioner,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:19-00190

M.E. REHERMAN, Warden,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his Proposed Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") on October 8, 2021, in which he recommended that the court grant respondent's Motion to Dismiss Petition (ECF No. 11); deny as moot petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 1); and dismiss this matter from the docket of the court. (ECF No. 13.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file objections to the PF&R. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985);

Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1365-66 (4th Cir. 1989); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." (emphasis added)).

Neither party filed objections to the PF&R within the required time period. Accordingly, the court adopts the PF&R as follows:

1. Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Petition (ECF No. 11) is **GRANTED**;
2. Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 1) is **DENIED** as moot; and
3. This matter is **DISMISSED** from the docket of the court.


Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v.

McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented parties.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 3rd day of December, 2021.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David A. Faber". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

David A. Faber

Senior United States District Judge