

**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

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-west-virginia-united-states-district-court/2026/eric-walker-v-fbop-warden-f-c-i-beckley-h831i37x>