

**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

---

**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

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-we/2026/dishannon-workman-v-fci-beckley-warden-5e2w2sf1>