

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Alan J. Williams v. F.C.I. Beckley Warden

Williams v. F.C.I. Beckley Warden · No. 5:25-cv-00189 · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopts a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation in a habeas corpus action. The court denies the petitioner’s motion for summary judgment, dismisses the habeas petition, and directs that the matter be removed from the docket because no objections were filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00189
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and moved for summary judgment. After a magistrate judge issued a PF&R recommending denial of both requests, no objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the district court conducts de novo review of those portions of a magistrate judge's proposed findings or recommendations to which a party objects. No de novo or other review is required for portions to which no objections are made, and general and conclusory objections that do not identify a specific error do not require de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Alan J. Williams v. F.C.I. Beckley Warden

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's PF&R when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the court should adopt the PF&R, deny the motion for summary judgment, and dismiss the habeas petition and action.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo or other review of the unobjected-to factual or legal conclusions, and the failure to object waives de novo review and the right to appeal the district court's order on that basis.
2. Because no objections were filed, the court adopted the PF&R, denied the motion for summary judgment, dismissed the petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and dismissed the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner’s right to appeal the Court’s order.”

“Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [ECF 14], DENIES the Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 11], DISMISSES the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1], and DISMISSES the matter.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no substantive facts underlying Williams's habeas petition. Williams filed a federal habeas petition and a motion for summary judgment, and the magistrate judge recommended that both be denied. Williams filed no objections to the PF&R.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Alan J. Williams filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on March 24, 2025, and a motion for summary judgment on May 12, 2025. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn, who issued a PF&R on November 19, 2025, recommending denial of the petition and motion and removal of the matter from the docket. Williams did not file objections by the December 8, 2025 deadline, so the district court adopted the PF&R, denied the motion for summary judgment, dismissed the habeas petition, 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 ALAN J. WILLIAMS, Petitioner, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-00189 F.C.I. BECKLEY WARDEN, Respondent. ORDER Pending are Petitioner Alan J. Williams’ Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF 1], filed March 24, 2025, and Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 11], filed May 12, 2025. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation (“PF&R”).

Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on November 19, 2025. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended the Court deny Mr. Williams’ Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus and Motion for Summary Judgment and remove this matter from the Court’s Docket. [ECF 14 at 14].

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 December 8, 2025. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [ECF 14], DENIES the Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 11], 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 12, 2026 “ams” 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/alan-j-williams-v-f-c-i-beckley-warden-in6q5c07>