

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
ELKINS**

THUAN M. PHAM,

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:16-CV-99
(BAILEY)**

**JENNIFER SAAD,
Warden**

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Amended Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. 18]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his Amended R&R on November 1, 2017, wherein he recommends this Court deny the petitioner's § 2241 petition and dismiss the petition without prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, 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). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v.*

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's Amended R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of service, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on November 7, 2017 [Doc. 21]. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the Amended R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the Amended Report and Recommendation [Doc. 18] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, this Court **ORDERS** that the petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. This Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of the respondent. The Clerk is further **DIRECTED** to terminate the original Report and Recommendation [Doc. 17], which is identical to the Amended Report and Recommendation which the exception of a clerical error as to the petitioner's name in the introduction section.

As a final matter, upon an independent review of the record, this Court hereby **DENIES** a certificate of appealability, finding that the petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record herein and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: November 27, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Preston Bailey", written over a horizontal line.

JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE