

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Shawn Lanier Lowman, Jr. v. Warden Holzapfel, FCI Beckley

Lowman · No. 5:25-cv-00307 · Decided February 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation in Shawn Lanier Lowman, Jr.'s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas action. The court denied the habeas petition and a related motion concerning law-library access, and dismissed the matter after no objections were filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Frank W. Volk
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	February 24, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00307
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and related motion for an order directing the respondent to provide a memorandum were referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended denial and dismissal. The district court adopted the proposed findings and recommendation without de novo review because no objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review of the unobjected-to portions. General and conclusory objections likewise do not require de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Shawn Lanier Lowman, Jr. v. Warden Holzapfel, FCI Beckley

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

federal civil procedure

magistrate judge recommendations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the court should adopt the PF&R, deny the § 2241 petition and related motion, and dismiss the action.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court need not conduct de novo review of the factual or legal conclusions in portions of a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation to which no timely objection is made; failure to object waives de novo review and the right to appeal those findings.
2. The court adopted the PF&R, denied the petition for a writ of habeas corpus under § 2241, denied the motion directing the respondent to issue a memorandum, and dismissed the matter.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [Doc. 10], DENIES Mr. Lowman's § 2241 Petition [Doc. 1], DENIES Mr. Lowman's Motion for Order Directing the Respondent to Issue a Memorandum [Doc. 7], and DISMISSES the matter."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petitioner, a federal inmate at FCI Beckley, sought habeas relief under § 2241 and requested an order requiring the respondent to identify dates when the unit was locked down and the law library was unavailable. The magistrate judge recommended denying both requests and dismissing the action. The petitioner filed no objections to the PF&R by the established deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lowman filed a § 2241 petition on May 8, 2025, and a motion concerning prison lockdown dates and law-library access on June 2, 2025. Magistrate Judge Joseph K. Reeder issued a proposed findings and recommendation on January 27, 2026, recommending denial of the petition and motion and dismissal of the case. No objections were filed by the February 13, 2026 deadline, so the district court adopted the PF&R, denied both requests, 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 SHAWN LANIER LOWMAN, JR., Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-00307 WARDEN HOLZAPFEL, FCI BECKLEY, Respondent. ORDER Pending are Petitioner Shawn Lanier Lowman, Jr.'s (1) Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed May 8, 2025, and (2) Motion for Order Directing the Respondent to Issue a Memorandum Stating the Days That the Unit was Locked Down and Access to the Law Library Unavailable [Doc.

7], filed June 2, 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 January 27, 2026. Magistrate Judge Reeder recommended that the Court deny Mr. Lowman's § 2241 Petition, deny his Motion for Order Directing the Respondent to Issue a Memorandum inasmuch as the relief requested does not affect the disposition of this action, and dismiss this matter from the docket.

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 February 13, 2026. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [Doc. 10], DENIES Mr. Lowman's § 2241 Petition [Doc. 1], DENIES Mr. Lowman's Motion for Order Directing the Respondent to Issue a Memorandum [Doc. 7], and DISMISSES the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: February 24, 2026 ©: W. Volk "agme" = Chief United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-we/2026/shawn-lanier-lowman-jr-v-warden-holzapfel-fci-beckley-huinxmap>