

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Franklin S. Jones

Petitioner,

vs.

T. Bragg, Warden,

Respondent.

Civil Action No.: 4:15-4193-BHH

**Opinion and Order**

This matter is before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") (ECF No. 8), which recommends that the § 2241 petition be dismissed *without prejudice* and without requiring the respondent to file a return. For the reasons set forth below, the Court agrees with the Report and dismisses the petition *without prejudice*.

**BACKGROUND**

Petitioner, Franklin S. Jones, a federal prisoner confined at Federal Correctional Institution Bennettsville, who is proceeding *pro se*, brought this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 alleging he is being wrongfully detained. As set forth in greater detail in the report, Petitioner contends that he was incorrectly classified as a "career offender" under United States Sentencing Guideline § 4B1.1 (USSG). Petitioner seeks to be resentenced "without the career offender designation." (ECF No. 1.)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the case was assigned to Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers. On October 30, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the § 2241 petition be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return.

Petitioner has filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on November 16, 2015.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the district court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the district court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The court is obligated to conduct a *de novo* review of every portion of the Report to which specific objections have been filed. *Id.* However, the court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “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) (“[D]e novo review [is] unnecessary in . . . situations 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 recommendation.”). Furthermore, in the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the court adopts and

incorporates the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8) by reference into this order. It is therefore ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED *without prejudice* and without requiring Respondent to file a return.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

December 21, 2015  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.