

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

Juvonta Lafond v. FCI Beckley Warden

Lafond · No. 5:23-cv-00718 · 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 Juvonta Lafond's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. Because Lafond was released from custody and no objections were filed, the court dismisses the petition as moot and removes the action from the docket.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT BECKLEY JUVONTA LAFOND, Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00718 FCI BECKLEY WARDEN, Respondent. ORDER Pending is Petitioner Juvonta Lafond's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed November 6, 2023. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R").

Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on January 5, 2026. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court dismiss as moot Mr. Lafond's § 2241 Petition given his release from custody 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. 10], DISMISSES AS MOOT Mr. Lafond’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 ©: W. Volk “Tae Chief United States District Judge