

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

**HENK ORLANDO ROMMY,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:17-CV-6  
(GROH)**

**JUDITH FRIEDMAN, Senior Trial  
Attorney, United States Department  
of Justice, and PAULA A. WOLFF,  
International Prisoner Transfer Unit,  
United States Department of Justice,**

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER  
ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael John Aloï. ECF No. 44. Pursuant to Rule 2 of the Local Rules of Prisoner Litigation Procedure, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Aloï for submission of a proposed report and recommendation ("R&R"). On January 31, 2018, Magistrate Judge Aloï filed an R&R in which he recommended that this Court dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint with 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). Moreover, “[w]hen a party does make objections, but these objections are so general or conclusory that they fail to direct the district court to any specific error by the magistrate judge, de novo review is unnecessary.” Green v. Rubenstein, 644 F. Supp. 2d 723, 730 (S.D. W. Va. 2009) (citing Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)). Failure to file timely objections also constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the Plaintiff’s right to appeal this Court’s Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); 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 Aloi’s R&R were due within fourteen days after the Plaintiff was served, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Plaintiff was served with the R&R on February 5, 2018. Accordingly, objections were due no later than February 23, 2018, after accounting for delivery time. No objections have been filed to date. Thus, the Court will undertake a *de novo* review of Magistrate Judge Aloi’s findings.


Upon careful review of the record, it is the opinion of this Court that Magistrate Judge Aloi’s Report and Recommendation should be, and is, hereby **ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated therein. Accordingly, the Plaintiff’s complaint [ECF No. 1] is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and **STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court. The Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss [ECF Nos. 32, 34] are **GRANTED**.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to transmit copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* Plaintiff by certified mail, return receipt requested, to his last known address as shown on the docket sheet. The Clerk is further **DIRECTED** to

**TERMINATE** the Plaintiff's Motion to Verify Service of Summons in a Civil Action [ECF No. 31] as **MOOT**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

**DATED:** February 26, 2018



GINA M. GROH  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE