


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



RONNIE LESHA ANDERSON, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 DIRECTOR OF THE VIRGINIA )  
 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, )  
 )  
 Respondent. )

Civil Action No. 3:14CV847-HEH

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**  
**(Adopting Report and Recommendation and Dismissing Action)**

Ronnie Lesha Anderson, a Virginia inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (“§ 2254 Petition,” ECF No. 3). On October 28, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation. The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court grant Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss and find Anderson’s § 2254 Petition barred by the relevant statute of limitations. The Magistrate Judge advised Anderson that he could file objections within fourteen (14) days after the entry of the Report and Recommendation. Anderson 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 to Dismiss (ECF No. 9) will be granted. Anderson’s claims and the action will be dismissed. The § 2254 Petition will be denied. The Court will deny a certificate of appealability.

An appropriate Final Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: Dec 4, 2015  
Richmond, Virginia

 /s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Henry E. Hudson  
United States District Judge