

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Eric Walker v. FBOP Warden, F.C.I. Beckley

Walker · No. 5:25-cv-00280 · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation in Eric Walker’s habeas corpus action. The court denied Walker’s motion to waive exhaustion of administrative remedies, dismissed the habeas petition, and dismissed the matter after no objections were filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00280
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation concerning a federal habeas petition and a motion to waive exhaustion of administrative remedies. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the PF&R, denied the motion to waive exhaustion, and dismissed the habeas petition and action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Absent specific and timely objections, the district court need not conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions. General and conclusory objections also do not trigger de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Eric Walker v. FBOP Warden, F.C.I. Beckley

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's PF&R when the petitioner filed no objections.
2. Whether the court should adopt the PF&R, deny the motion to waive exhaustion of administrative remedies, and dismiss the federal habeas petition.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party files no timely objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review of the unobjected-to factual or legal conclusions, and the failure to object waives the right to appeal those conclusions.
2. General and conclusory objections that do not identify a specific error in a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation do not require de novo review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner’s right to appeal the Court’s order.” (Order)

“Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [ECF 12], DENIES the Motion to Waive the Requirement to Exhaust Administrative Remedies [ECF 4], DISMISSES the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1], and DISMISSES the matter.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eric Walker filed a federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus and sought to waive the requirement that he exhaust administrative remedies. The magistrate judge recommended denying the waiver motion and dismissing the petition. Walker filed no objections to the PF&R by the deadline set by the court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Walker filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and a motion to waive the requirement to exhaust administrative remedies on April 28, 2025. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Joseph K. Reeder, who issued a PF&R recommending denial of the waiver motion and dismissal of the petition. Because Walker filed no objections by the January 20, 2026 deadline, the district court adopted the PF&R and dismissed the matter.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985)

- United States v. De Leon-Ramirez, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019)
- Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989)
- Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT BECKLEY ERIC WALKER, Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-00280 FBOP WARDEN, F. C. I. Beckley, Respondent. ORDER Pending are Petitioner Eric Walker's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1] and Motion to Waive the Requirement to Exhaust Administrative Remedies [ECF 4], both filed April 28, 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 December 31, 2025. [ECF 12]. Magistrate Judge Reeder recommended the Court deny Mr. Walker's Motion to Waive the Requirement to Exhaust Administrative Remedies [ECF 4] and dismiss Mr. Walker's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1].

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 20, 2026. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [ECF 12], DENIES the Motion to Waive the Requirement to Exhaust Administrative Remedies [ECF 4], DISMISSES the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1], and DISMISSES the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: January 26, 2026 "Tams Chief United States District Judge

