

**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.

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 [Doc. 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