

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**CHARLESTON DIVISION**

KAREEM RANDOLPH,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-cv-00902

SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL JAIL,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Kareem Randolph's ("Plaintiff") Complaint. (ECF No. 2.) By Standing Order entered in this case on May 9, 2018, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation for disposition ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R on September 10, 2019, recommending that this Court dismiss this action for failing to state a claim against the South Central Regional Jail, as it is not an entity capable of being sued; failure to complete proper service of the complaint pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 19.)

This 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). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder*

*v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).


Objections to the PF&R were due on September 27, 2021. (ECF No. 8.) To date, Plaintiff has failed to submit any objection in response to the PF&R, thus constituting a waiver of *de novo* review and Plaintiff’s right to appeal this Court’s order.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R, (ECF No. 19), and **DISMISSES** this action **WITH PREJUDICE**. The Court further **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this matter from the Court’s docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER:        October 4, 2021



---

THOMAS E. JOHNSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE