

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA**

Jeffrey Rahim Colberth v. Warden at Lieber Correctional Institution

Colberth · No. 4:26-cv-209-JFA-TER · Decided March 25, 2026

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA Jeffrey Rahim Colberth, #244635, C/A No. 4:26-cv-209-JFA-TER Petitioner, v. ORDER Warden at Lieber Correctional Institution, Respondent. Jeffrey Rahim Colberth (“Petitioner”), proceeding pro se, filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), the case was referred to the Magistrate Judge for initial review. After performing an initial review of the petition pursuant to the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings for the United States District Court, the Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ prepared a thorough report and recommendation (“Report”).

(ECF No. 8). Within the Report, the Magistrate Judge opines the Petition is subject to dismissal because it is successive and presented without an order from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals authorizing this Court to consider a successive petition.

The Report sets forth, in detail, the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and this Court incorporates those facts and standards without a recitation. ¹ The Magistrate Judge’s review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.).

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). Petitioner was advised of his right to object to the Report, which was entered on the docket on January 28, 2026. *Id.* The Magistrate Judge required Petitioner to file objections by February 11, 2026.

Id. Moreover, this court granted a belated request for extension and gave Petitioner until March 9, 2026, to file objections. (ECF No. 13). However, Petitioner failed to file objections and the time for doing so has elapsed.

Thus, this matter is ripe for review. A district court is only required to conduct a de novo review of the specific portions of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which an objection is made. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Carniewski v. W. Virginia Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 974 F.2d 1330 (4th Cir. 1992).

In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Magistrate's Report, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Here, Petitioner has failed to raise any objections and therefore this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. A review of the Report indicates that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that the petition is subject to dismissal.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law.

Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. (ECF No. 8). Consequently, the petition is dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. It is further ordered that a certificate of appealability is denied because Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).?

IT IS SO ORDERED. March 25, 2026 Joseph F. Anderson, Jr. Columbia, South Carolina United States District Judge? A certificate of appealability will not issue absent 'a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.' 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong.

See *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In the instant matter, the court finds that Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right."