

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Christopher Adam Jackson v. Curtis Dixon

Jackson v. Dixon · No. 5:25-cv-00480 · Decided June 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation concerning Christopher Adam Jackson’s petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court denied the petition and dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), after no objections were filed.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT BECKLEY CHRISTOPHER ADAM JACKSON, Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-00480 CURTIS DIXON, Respondent. ORDER Pending is Petitioner Christopher Adam Jackson’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed August 1, 2025. 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 May 8, 2026. Magistrate Judge Reeder recommended that the Court deny Mr. Jackson’s § 2241 Petition and dismiss this matter without prejudice for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

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 May 26, 2026. No objections were filed.!

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [Doc. 8], DENIES Mr. Jackson’s § 2241 Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. 1], DISMISSES this matter without prejudice for failure to prosecute under Rule 41(b), 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: June 3, 2026 Zl\la Frank W. Volk “ame” Chief United States District Judge ' On May 8, 2026, a copy of the PF&R was mailed to Mr. Jackson at Southern Regional Jail but was returned as undeliverable on May 19, 2026. [Doc. 9].

On May 19, 2026, the PF&R was subsequently remailed to Mr. Jackson at his last provided address. [/d.]. At this writing, no response has been received. The matter is thus ripe for adjudication.