

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

BECKLEY DIVISION

GREGORY DEVON WORSLEY,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:13-cv-08096

JOEL ZIEGLER, Warden,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On April 16, 2013, the Petitioner, acting *pro se*, filed his *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1) and his *Memorandum of Law* (Document 2) in support thereof. Thereafter, on April 22, 2013, the Petitioner filed his *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 5).

By *Standing Order* (Document 4) entered on April 19, 2013, 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. Subsequently, by *Order* (Document 8) entered on January 6, 2016, the case was referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition.

On February 24, 2016, Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn, submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 10) wherein it is recommended that this Court deny the Petitioner's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 5), dismiss the Petitioner's

Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody (Documents 1 & 2), and remove this matter from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by March 14, 2016.¹

Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*. 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).

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 the Petitioner's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 5) be **DENIED**, the Petitioner's *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Documents 1 & 2) be **DISMISSED**, and this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

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

ENTER: March 16, 2016



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

¹The docket reflects that the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* mailed to the Petitioner was returned as undeliverable on March 14, 2016.