

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Chad Jeremy Adams v. William Chris Rankin, et al.

Adams v. Rankin · No. CIV-25-0693-HE · Decided February 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Because the petitioner failed to exhaust administrative remedies and did not object to the recommendation, the court dismissed the petition without prejudice to refiling.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	February 3, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-25-0693-HE
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after petitioner failed to object.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the Report and Recommendation after the absence of timely objections, applying the rule that failure to object waives appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Chad Jeremy Adams v. William Chris Rankin, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- exhaustion of remedies
- post-conviction relief

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- administrative law
- post-conviction relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the petition should be dismissed without prejudice because petitioner failed to exhaust administrative remedies.
2. Whether petitioner's failure to object to the Report and Recommendation waived appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in it.

HOLDINGS

1. Because petitioner filed no timely objection, he waived the right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation.
2. The petition was dismissed without prejudice because petitioner failed to exhaust administrative remedies.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The magistrate judge determined that petitioner had failed to exhaust administrative remedies. Petitioner was notified of the deadline and consequences for objecting to the Report and Recommendation but filed no objection.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 7, 2026, Magistrate Judge Amanda L. Maxfield recommended dismissal without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, or alternatively denial of the petition. After petitioner failed to object by the January 28, 2026 deadline, the district court adopted the recommendation insofar as it required dismissal for nonexhaustion and dismissed the petition without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Moore v. United States, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA CHAD JEREMY ADAMS,)) Petitioner,)) -vs-) NO. CIV-25-0693-HE) WILLIAM CHRIS RANKIN, et al.,)) Respondents.) ORDER On January 7, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Amanda L. Maxfield issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 be dismissed without prejudice to re-filing, for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

In the alternative, she recommends the habeas petition be denied. Judge Maxfield advised petitioner of the right to object to the Report and Recommendation as well as the consequences for

failure to timely object. Any objection to the Report and Recommendation was due by January 28, 2026.

To date, no objection has been filed. Petitioner has therefore waived the right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation. See *Moore v. United States*, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991).

Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation [Doc. #7] to the extent it recommends dismissal of the habeas petition based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies.' On that basis, the petition [Doc. #1] is DISMISSED, without prejudice to re-filing. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 3rd day of February, 2026. JO XTON ~ STATES DISTRICT JUDGE In light of this ruling, the court does not address Magistrate Judge Maxfield's alternative recommendation to deny the habeas petition.