

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

Yohnus Adam Michael Cameron v. Angela Stuff, Warden, Richmond
Correctional Institution

Cameron · No. 1:25-cv-196 · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio recommends denying Yohnus Adam Michael Cameron’s motion to proceed to judgment in his habeas corpus proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The recommendation concludes that the respondent timely filed the answer and state-court record, and it provides notice of the procedure and deadline for filing objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephanie K. Bowman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-196
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought judgment in a federal habeas action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 based on the alleged untimeliness of Respondent's answer. The Chief Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending denial of the motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Yohnus Adam Michael Cameron v. Angela Stuff, Warden, Richmond Correctional Institution

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- default judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Post-conviction relief
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Respondent timely complied with the court's June 12, 2025 order requiring an answer and relevant portions of the state-court record within 60 days.
2. Whether Cameron was entitled to judgment against Respondent based on the alleged failure to timely answer the § 2254 petition.

HOLDINGS

1. Respondent's Return of Writ was timely filed, so Cameron was not entitled to judgment based on an untimely response.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “Respondent filed state-court record exhibits on August 8, 2025 (Doc. 11), and the Return of Writ (Answer) on August 11, 2025 (Doc. 12).” (at 2)
- “It was not untimely.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Cameron is an inmate in state custody and challenges a 2014 Butler County Court of Common Pleas judgment entered after his guilty pleas to two first-degree felony rape counts. In the federal habeas proceeding, the court ordered Respondent to answer within 60 days of June 12, 2025. Respondent filed the state-court record on August 8, 2025, and the Return of Writ on August 11, 2025, prompting Cameron to seek judgment based on alleged untimeliness.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Cameron filed a § 2254 petition challenging a 2014 Butler County, Ohio, criminal judgment. After initially directing Cameron to show cause concerning exhaustion, the court ordered Respondent to answer within 60 days. Respondent filed state-court record exhibits on August 8, 2025, and a Return of Writ on August 11, 2025. Cameron then moved to proceed to judgment, asserting that Respondent had failed to comply timely; the Report and Recommendation recommends denying that motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985)
- United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI YOHNUS ADAM MICHAEL: Case No. 1:25-cv-196 CAMERON,;

Petitioner,; Judge Matthew W. McFarland vs.:: Chief Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. ANGELA STUFF, WARDEN,; Bowman RICHMOND CORRECTIONAL: INSTITUTION,; Respondent. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Petitioner, an inmate in state custody at the Richmond Correctional Institution, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

(Doc. 1). This matter is before the undersigned Magistrate Judge for consideration of Petitioner's Motion to Proceed to Judgment. (Doc. 14). For the reasons set forth below, it is RECOMMENDED that Petitioner's motion be DENIED.

In this case, Petitioner challenges a criminal judgment issued by the Butler County Court of Common Pleas against him in 2014 upon his guilty pleas to two first degree felony counts of rape, Case No. CR2013-09-1520. (Doc. 1, at 1-2).

After issuing an order directing Petitioner to show cause why this Petition should not be dismissed without prejudice for the failure to exhaust state remedies (Doc. 6), the Undersigned ultimately ordered Respondent to respond to the Petition within 60 days (Doc. 8). Respondent complied with a Return of Writ filed on August 11, 2025. (Doc. 12). Petitioner has filed several pleadings, some responsive and others not, that are not before the Court at this time and will be addressed at a later date.

(Doc. Nos. 10, 13, and 15). At issue is Petitioner's Motion to Proceed to Judgment (Doc. 14), wherein Petitioner appears to move the Court to enter judgment against Respondent, due to Respondent's failure to timely comply with the Doc. 8 Order for Answer. (Doc. 14, at 496). Respondent counters that Petitioner is mistaken. (Doc. 16, at 524). Respondent is correct.

The Undersigned gave Respondent 60 days from its June 12, 2025, Order to file an answer to the Petition and relevant portions of the state court record. (Doc. 8, at 34). Respondent filed state-court record exhibits on August 8, 2025 (Doc. 11), and the Return of Writ (Answer) on August 11, 2025 (Doc. 12). Sixty days from June 12, 2025, is, as Respondent points out, August 11, 2026.

And that is the date the Return of Writ was filed. It was not untimely. Accordingly, it is RECOMMENDED that Petitioner's Motion to Proceed to Judgment (Doc. 14) is be DENIED. NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), WITHIN 14 DAYS after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.

This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum on law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree

upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the 2 assigned District Judge otherwise directs.

A party may respond to another party's objections WITHIN 14 DAYS after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). February 5, 2026 s/Stephanie K. Bowman Stephanie K. Bowman United States Chief Magistrate Judge 3