


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division



CHARLES BROOKS,)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 v.)
)
 ERIC D. WILSON,)
)
 Respondent.)

Civil Action No. 3:14CV493-HEH

MEMORANDUM OPINION
(Adopting Report and Recommendation and Dismissing Action)

Charles Brooks, a federal inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (“§ 2241 Petition,” ECF No. 1). Brooks asserts that although he is “entitled to at least 150 days sentence credit in recognition of [his] achievement of a GED,” the Bureau of Prisons failed to award him such sentence credit. (§ 2241 Pet. 8.) Respondent has moved to dismiss (ECF No. 6) or in the alternative moved for summary judgment (ECF No. 7) on the ground that Brooks’s claim lacks merit. Brooks did not respond. On June 25, 2015, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court grant the Motion for Summary Judgment and dismiss the § 2241 Petition because Brooks’s claim lacks merit. (ECF No. 11.) The Court advised Brooks that he could file objections within fourteen (14) days after the entry of the Report and Recommendation. Brooks has not responded.


“The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court.” *Estrada v. Witkowski*, 816 F. Supp. 408, 410 (D.S.C. 1993) (citing

Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)). This Court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “The filing of objections to a magistrate’s report enables the district judge to focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). In the absence of a specific written objection, this Court may adopt a magistrate judge’s recommendation without conducting a de novo review. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 316 (4th Cir. 2005).

There being no objections, the Report and Recommendation will be accepted and adopted. The Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 7) will be granted. The Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 6) will be denied as moot. Brooks’s claim and the action will be dismissed.

An appropriate Final Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: July 21 2015
Richmond, Virginia

 _____ /s/
Henry E. Hudson
United States District Judge