

**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.

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