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

DAVID E. HUESTON,

Petitioner.

٧.

CIV. ACT. NO. 5:24-CV-81 Judge Bailey

**R. BROWN,** Warden, FCI Gilmer, and **DR. McCOY,** FCI Gilmer, "Care Provider",

Respondents.

## <u>ORDER</u>

The above-referenced case is before this Court upon the magistrate judge's recommendations that the petition [Doc. 1] filed by Petitioner David E. Hueston be denied and dismissed without prejudice to the petitioner's right to file his claims in a civil rights action and that the pending Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 2] 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. 6] is ADOPTED and the petition [Doc. 1] is DENIED and DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to the petitioner's right to file his claims

in a civil rights action. Further, the petitioner's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma

pauperis [Doc. 2] is DENIED AS MOOT.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED TO STRIKE** the above-styled 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 herein and to *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED**: June 5, 2024.

JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE