

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Juvonta Lafond v. FCI Beckley Warden

Civil Action No. 5:24-cv-558 (S.D. W. Va. May 5, 2026) · No. 5:24-cv-558 · Decided May 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation in Juvonta Lafond’s petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Because Lafond had been released from custody and no objections were filed, the court dismissed the petition as moot and removed the case from the docket.

OPINION

Lafond

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

AT BECKLEY

JUVONTA LAFOND,

Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:24-cv-558

FCI BECKLEY WARDEN,

Respondent.

ORDER

Pending is Petitioner Juvonta Lafond’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF 1], filed October 9, 2024. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation (“PF&R”). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on January 5, 2026. [See ECF 10]. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court dismiss as moot Mr. Lafond’s § 2241 Petition given his release from custody and remove this matter from the docket. [Id. at 3]. 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 January 22, 2026. No objections were filed. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [ECF 10], DISMISSES AS MOOT Mr. Lafond's § 2241 Petition [ECF 1], and REMOVES this matter from the docket. The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: May 5, 2026 FaedN Va ©: W. Volk Chief United States District Judge