

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA, CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Anthony Mills v. Arlene Bluth

Mills · No. 2:26-cv-00133 · Decided June 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge's recommendation to deny Anthony Mills's application to proceed without prepayment of fees or costs. Because no objections were filed, the court dismissed the civil action from the docket.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA CHARLESTON DIVISION ANTHONY MILLS, Plaintiff, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:26-cv-00133 ARLENE BLUTH, Defendant. MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Anthony Mills's Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees or Costs. (ECF No. 1.) By Standing Order entered September 1, 2024 and filed in this case on February 24, 2026, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R").

(ECF No. 3.) Magistrate Judge Tinsley filed his PF&R on February 25, 2026, recommending that the Court DENY the Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and that this civil action be DISMISSED with prejudice. (ECF No. 4.)

The Court is not required to review, under 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. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir.1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a 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 to the PF&R in this case were due on March 16, 2026. (ECF No. 4.) To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R, (ECF No. 4), DENIES the

Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees, (ECF No. 1), and DISMISSES this case from the docket. IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: June 17, 2026 THOMAS E. JOHNSTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE