

**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.

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