

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Jessica Pechtel v. Warden Cutright, FPC Alderson

Pechtel · No. 1:24-00365 · Decided May 19, 2026

OPINION

Pechtel

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BLUEFIELD

JESSICA PECHTEL,

Plaintiff,

v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:24-00365

WARDEN CUTRIGHT, FPC Alderson, Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of findings and recommendations regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his Findings and Recommendation (“PF&R”) on September 5, 2024, in which he recommended that the district court deny plaintiff’s petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 as moot, deny her Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs as moot, dismiss this civil action, and remove this matter from the court’s docket. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley’s Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections constitutes a waiver of such party’s right to a de novo review by this court. *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989). The parties failed to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation within the seventeen-day period. Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Tinsley, the court adopts the findings and recommendations contained therein. Accordingly, the court hereby DENIES plaintiff’s petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 as moot, DENIES her Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs as moot, DISMISSES this civil action, and directs the Clerk to remove this case from the court’s active docket. Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is

debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court DENIES a certificate of appealability. The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to plaintiff and counsel of record. IT IS SO ORDERED this 19th day of May, 2026. ENTER: David A. Faber Senior United States District Judge