

**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.

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