

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

**STEPHEN K. HARRIS,**

Petitioner,

v.

**Civil Action No. 5:21-CV-52**  
Judge Bailey

**R.M. WOLFE,** Warden,

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The above referenced case is before this Court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, or, in the alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 11] be granted and petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be denied and dismissed with prejudice. Moreover, Magistrate Judge Mazzone recommends that petitioner's Motion Requesting an Evidentiary Hearing [Doc. 16] be denied as moot.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. ***United***

**States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

A *de novo* review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation [Doc. 17] is **AFFIRMED**, and Respondent's Motion to Dismiss or, in the alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 11] is **GRANTED** and petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. Furthermore, petitioner's Motion Requesting an Evidentiary Hearing [Doc. 16] is hereby **DENIED AS MOOT**. This Court further **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of the respondent and to **STRIKE** this case from the active docket of this Court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

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

**DATED:** October 5, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**JOHN PRESTON BAILEY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**