

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

Ethan Neal Hendricks v. Warden FCI Pollock

Hendricks · No. 1:25-CV-01275 · Decided March 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The document is a Report and Recommendation addressing Ethan Neal Hendricks’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging the Bureau of Prisons’ calculation and denial of First Step Act earned time credits. The magistrate judge recommends dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because Hendricks failed to comply with an order requiring amendment of the petition and proof of exhaustion.

OPINION

a UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION ETHAN NEAL HENDRICKS #30607- CIVIL DOCKET NO. 1:25-CV-01275 510, SEC P Petitioner VERSUS JUDGE DRELL WARDEN F C I POLLOCK, MAGISTRATE JUDGE PEREZ-MONTES Respondent REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Before the Court is a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 filed by pro se Petitioner Ethan Neal Hendricks (“Hendricks”).

Hendricks is imprisoned at the Federal Correctional Institution in Pollock, Louisiana. He challenges the computation of his sentence by the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”). Because Hendricks failed to comply with the Order to Amend, the Petition should be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

I. Background Hendricks alleges that the BOP has denied him earned time credits under the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194 (enacted December 21, 2018). ECF No. 1 at 2. He seeks application of the credits and a speedier release from custody. Hendricks was ordered to amend the Petition to state whether he exhausted administrative remedies, and submit proof of same.

ECF No. 6. II. Law and Analysis A district court may dismiss an action for a petitioner’s failure to prosecute or to comply with any order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The dismissal may occur upon the motion of a defendant or the Court’s own motion.

The authority to dismiss is provided to “achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases”; to “prevent undue delays”; and to “avoid congestion in the calendars of the District Courts.” 370

U.S. 626, 629-31 (1962);, 730 F.2d 248, 251 (5th Cir. 1984); 617 F.2d 1164, 1167 (5th Cir. 1980). Hendricks was ordered to amend the Petition by December 5, 2025.

ECF No. 6. To date, he has failed to comply with the Order, and he has not requested an extension of time within which to comply. Therefore, the Petition should be dismissed under Rule 41. III. Conclusion Because Hendricks failed to comply with the Court's Order, IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Petition (ECF No. 1) be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), a party may file written objections to this Report and Recommendation within 14 days of service, unless the Court grants an extension of time to file objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may also respond to another party's objections to this Report and Recommendation within 14 days of service of those objections, again unless the Court grants an extension of time to file a response to objections.

No other briefs may be filed without leave of court, which will only be granted for good cause. A party's failure to timely file written objections to this Report and Recommendation will bar a party from later challenging factual or legal conclusions adopted by the District Judge, except if the challenge asserts "plain error." SIGNED on Thursday, March 12, 2026.

JOSEPH H.L. PEREZ-MONTES UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE