

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

**BECKLEY DIVISION**

ROLAND JEVON HOPKINS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:10-cv-01356

JOEL ZIEGLER,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

The Court has reviewed the Petitioner's December 7, 2010 *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1) and March 15, 2011 *Motion to Amend Argument in Support of Title 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Motion* (Document 6).


By *Standing Order* (Document 3) entered on December 7, 2010, this action was 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 October 31, 2013, the Magistrate Judge submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 11) wherein it is recommended that this Court dismiss the Petitioner's Application (Documents 1 & 6) and remove this matter from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by November 18, 2013.

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 Petitioner's *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1) and *Motion to Amend Argument in Support of Title 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Motion* (Document 6) be **DISMISSED**, and that this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

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: November 19, 2013

  
IRENE C. BERGER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA