

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BLUEFIELD

IRVIN LAMAR SIMPSON

Petitioner,

v.

Civil Action No: 1:15-03479

BART MASTERS,
Warden

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the court are petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, (Doc. No. 1), and motions for final disposition or order in a habeas corpus proceeding. (Doc. Nos. 15, 16). By Order, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Cheryl A. Eifert for submission of findings and recommendations regarding disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). (Doc. No. 2). Magistrate Judge Eifert submitted to the court her Proposed Findings and Recommendation on April 6, 2016, in which she recommended that the district court deny petitioner's motions for final disposition or order, dismiss petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus, and remove this matter from the court's docket. (Doc. No. 17 at 17).

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing

days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Eifert's Findings and Recommendation. The failure to file such objections constitutes a waiver of the right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Petitioner failed to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the seventeen-day period. Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Eifert, the court adopts the findings and recommendation contained therein.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." Id. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The court hereby **ADOPTS** the factual and legal analysis contained within the PF&R, **DENIES** petitioner's motions for final disposition or order in a habeas proceeding, (Doc. Nos. 15, 16), **DISMISSES** petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus, (Doc. No. 1), and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this case from the court's docket.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and petitioner, pro se.

It is **SO ORDERED** this 19th day of May, 2016.

ENTER:



David A. Faber

Senior United States District Judge