

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN DIVISION

Cordeyair Brown v. Ward Calhoun

Civil Action No. 3:24-CV-492-DPJ-ASH · No. Civil Action No. 3:24-CV-492-DPJ-ASH · Decided January 27,
2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in Cordeyair Brown's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court granted the respondent's motion to dismiss, dismissed the claims concerning the initial appearance and ineffective assistance of counsel with prejudice, and dismissed the speedy-trial claim without prejudice for failure to exhaust.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION CORDEYAIR BROWN PETITIONER V. CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-CV-492-DPJ-ASH WARD CALHOUN RESPONDENT ORDER Cordeyair Brown, a pretrial detainee held at the Lauderdale County Detention facility in Meridian, Mississippi, filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 on August 21, 2024.

Pet. [1] at 1. On March 18, 2025, Respondent Ward Calhoun moved to dismiss the petition. Mot. [11]. On January 2, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris entered a Report and Recommendation [15] recommending that the Court (1) grant Respondent Calhoun's motion [11]; (2) deny Brown's request for an evidentiary hearing; (3) dismiss with prejudice Brown's claims based on the initial appearance and ineffective assistance of counsel; and (4) dismiss the speedy-trial claim without prejudice because Brown failed to exhaust.

R&R [15] at 1. Brown did not file an objection, and the time to do so has passed. See *id.* at 6–7 (informing Brown that he had 14 days to file an objection). “When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note (1983), quoted in *Douglass v. United Servs.*

Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) as noted in *Alexander v. Verizon Wireless Servs., L.L.C.*, 875 F.3d 243, 248 (5th Cir. 2017). Having reviewed the record and found no clear error, the Court accepts Judge Harris's well-reasoned recommendation. IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation

[15] of United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris is adopted as the finding and holding of this Court.

Consistent with the Report and Recommendation, Respondent Calhoun's motion [11] is granted, Brown's petition [1] is dismissed with prejudice, except for his claims regarding his right to a speedy trial, which are dismissed without prejudice. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 27th day of January, 2026. s/ Daniel P. Jordan III UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE