

**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

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