

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

OPINION

Dixon

PER CURIAM.

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 ZI\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.