Roddy v. Childers, et al Doc. 231

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

BECKLEY DIVISION

BOBBY EUGENE RODDY,

Plaintiff.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:03-cv-00612

MR. CHILDERS, et al.,

v.

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Plaintiff's Motions to Reopen (Documents 205, 214, 215 & 217) filed on March 29, 2010, May 16, 2011, December 13, 2011, and November 28, 2012. The Court has also reviewed the Plaintiff's *Petition for Immediate Relief Under Congress Spending Clause Power Unpholding (RLUIPA)* (Document 210) filed on November 22, 2010.

By orders (Documents 220 & 221) entered on October 7, 2013, the aforesaid motions were referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On September 4, 2014, the Magistrate Judge submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 229) wherein it is recommended that this Court deny the Plaintiff's Motions to Reopen and deny the Plaintiff's *Petition for Immediate Relief Under Congress Spending Clause Power Unpholding (RLUIPA)*. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by September 22, 2014.

Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings*

and Recommendation. The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other

standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the

findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140,

150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the

Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Snyder v.

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th

Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS and incorporates herein the findings and

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and

Recommendation, and ORDERS that the Plaintiff's Motions to Reopen (Documents 205, 214,

215 & 217) be **DENIED** and that the Plaintiff's Petition for Immediate Relief Under Congress

Spending Clause Power Unpholding (RLUIPA) (Document 210) be **DENIED**.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge

VanDervort, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: September 24, 2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

2