

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

THOMAS SAVOCA,

Movant,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:16-06666

CRIMINAL NO. 2:03-00194-01

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his Proposed Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") on October 8, 2020, in which he recommended that the court deny movant's Emergency Motion to Correct Sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (ECF No. 293) and his pro se letter-form motion to supplement (ECF No. 346), and dismiss this civil action from the docket of the court. (ECF No. 371.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file objections to the PF&R. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir.

1989). The parties failed to file objections to the PF&R within the required time period.

Accordingly, the court adopts the PF&R as follows:


1. Movant's Emergency Motion to Correct Sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (ECF No. 293) and his pro se letter-form motion to supplement (ECF No. 346) are **DENIED**; and
2. This civil action is **DISMISSED** from the docket of the court.

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." 28 U.S.C. § 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 Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of February, 2022.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber

Senior United States District Judge