

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**AT BECKLEY**

CHRISTOPHER BARFIELD,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:18-cv-00323

D.L. YOUNG, Warden, FCI Beckley,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending is the Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State or Federal Custody [Doc. 1], filed on February 16, 2018. This action was previously referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R on November 15, 2019. Magistrate Judge Tinsley recommended that the Court deny the petition and remove the matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not 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. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *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). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (noting parties may not typically "appeal a magistrate

judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on December 2, 2019. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 13**], **DENIES** the Petitioner’s Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State or Federal Custody [**Doc. 1**], and **ORDERS** the matter stricken.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTERED: December 12, 2019



*Frank W. Volk*  
Frank W. Volk  
United States District Judge