

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Dishannon Workman v. FCI Beckley Warden

Workman · No. 5:24-cv-00556 · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopts a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation in a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas action. The court grants the respondent’s motion to dismiss, denies Dishannon Workman’s petition, and removes the matter from the docket after no objections were filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Frank W. Volk
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	January 28, 2026
DOCKET	5:24-cv-00556
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Respondent moved to dismiss. After a magistrate judge issued a proposed findings and recommendation recommending dismissal and denial of the petition, no objections were filed, and the district court adopted the recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Absent timely objections, the district court need not conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions. General and conclusory objections that do not identify a specific error likewise do not require de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order.
PARTIES	Dishannon Workman v. FCI Beckley Warden

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- motions to dismiss
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

federal civil procedure

magistrate judge recommendations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's PF&R when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation should be adopted, the Warden's motion to dismiss granted, and the § 2241 petition denied.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court was not required to conduct de novo or other review of the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions because no objections were filed.
2. The court adopted the PF&R, granted the Respondent Warden's motion to dismiss, denied Workman's § 2241 petition, and removed the matter from the docket.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.””

“A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual findings concerning the underlying habeas claims. Workman filed a petition under § 2241, and the FCI Beckley Warden moved to dismiss. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal and denial of the petition, and Workman filed no objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Workman filed the § 2241 petition on October 9, 2024, and the Warden moved to dismiss on December 13, 2024. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Joseph K. Reeder, who issued a PF&R on January 5, 2026, recommending that the motion to dismiss be granted and the petition denied. Because no objections were filed by the January 22, 2026 deadline, the district court adopted the PF&R, granted the motion to dismiss, denied the petition, and removed the matter from the docket.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985)

- United States v. De Leon-Ramirez, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019)
- Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989)
- Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT BECKLEY DISHANNON WORKMAN, Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:24-cv-00556 FCI BECKLEY WARDEN, Respondent. ORDER Pending are (1) Petitioner Dishannon Workman's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed October 9, 2024, and (2) Respondent Warden's Motion to Dismiss [Doc.

11], filed December 13, 2024. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Joseph K. Reeder, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Reeder filed his PF&R on January 5, 2026. Magistrate Judge Reeder recommended that the Court grant Respondent Warden's Motion to Dismiss, deny Mr. Workman's § 2241 Petition, and remove this matter from the docket.

The Court need not 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. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." (emphasis added)).

Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also *United States v. De Leon- Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically "appeal a magistrate judge's findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn't require de novo review absent objection."); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir.

1989). Further, the Court need not conduct 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 in this case were due on January 22, 2026. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [Doc. 16], GRANTS Respondent Warden's Motion to Dismiss [Doce. 11], DENIES Mr. Workman's § 2241 Petition [Doc. 1], and REMOVES this matter from the docket. The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: January 28, 2026 Frank W. Volk "lame" = Chief United States District Judge

