

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

BECKLEY DIVISION

CHASE MICHAEL WALTERS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:11-cv-00226

JOEL ZIEGLER,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
ADOPTING PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 For Writ of *Habeas Corpus* By a Person in State or Federal Custody (Documents 1 & 5). By Order (Document 4) entered on April 6, 2011, this action was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On March 9, 2012, the Magistrate Judge submitted Proposed Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") (Document 9), wherein it is recommended that this Court dismiss Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of *Habeas Corpus* By a Person in State or Federal Custody (Documents 1 & 5) and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The 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 and the Petitioner's right to appeal this

Court's Order. 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).

Originally, objections to the PF&R were due no later than March 26, 2012. However, by Order (Document 12) entered on March 16, 2012, the Court granted in part *Petitioner's Request for an Extension of time to Reply to Magistrate's Proposed Findings and Recommendations* (Document 11). Petitioner was given an extension of fifteen (15) days to file objections to the PF&R, thereby making his objections due no later than April 10, 2012. To date, no party has filed any objections.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and **ORDERS** that Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 For Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody (Documents 1 & 5) be **DISMISSED**. Further, the Court **ORDERS** that this matter be removed from the docket.

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

ENTER: April 16, 2012



IRENE C. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA