

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

**BECKLEY DIVISION**

RASHEE GRANT,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:11-cv-00571

JOEL ZIEGLER,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

The Court has reviewed the Petitioner's August 23, 2011, *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1), and the Petitioner's August 30, 2011, *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 4) filed in this matter.

By *Standing Order* (Document 3) entered on August 23, 2011, 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 9, 2013, the Magistrate Judge submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 8) wherein it is recommended that this Court deny the Petitioner's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs*, dismiss the Petitioner's *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody*, and remove


this matter from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by October 28, 2013.<sup>1</sup>

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 to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 4) be **DENIED**, 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) be **DISMISSED**, and 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: October 29, 2013

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

---

<sup>1</sup>The docket reflects that the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* mailed to the Petitioner was returned as undeliverable on October 17, 2013.