

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
TEXAS, CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

Stephen Wayne Richardson v. Eric Guerrero, Director, TDCJ-CID

Richardson v. Guerrero · No. 2:25-CV-00222 · Decided April 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton’s Memorandum and Recommendation in full. The court dismisses Stephen Wayne Richardson’s petition for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 because no objections were filed and the recommendation was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division                                                                                                           |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Davi Orales                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division                                                                                                           |
| DECIDED               | April 22, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-CV-00222                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending dismissal of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. No party filed objections. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation, the district court reviews it for clear error or whether it is contrary to law.                           |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unknown                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| PARTIES               | Stephen Wayne Richardson v. Eric Guerrero, Director, TDCJ-CID                                                                                                                                      |

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation was clearly erroneous or contrary to law when no timely objection was filed.
2. Whether the petitioner's § 2241 petition should be dismissed.

## HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine whether the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2. The court adopted the Memorandum and Recommendation in its entirety and dismissed the petitioner's § 2241 petition.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge’s M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” (1/2)*

*“Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the Parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court ADOPTS the M&R in its entirety.” (1/2)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 filed by Stephen Wayne Richardson against the Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Eric Guerrero. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal, and no party objected to that recommendation.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2241 petition. Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton recommended dismissal. After receiving notice and an opportunity to object, the parties filed no objections. The district court found the M&R not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, adopted it in its entirety, and dismissed the petition.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)
- Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P., No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.)

## OPINION

Guerrero

PER CURIAM.

□ Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

April 22, 2026 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

§

STEPHEN WAYNE RICHARDSON, §

§ Petitioner, § §

V. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00222

§

ERIC GUERRERO, DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID, §

§ Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM & RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R"). (D.E. 22). The M&R recommends that the Court dismiss Petitioner's § 2241 petition. (D-E. 1). The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P.*, No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.) (citation omitted). Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the Parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court ADOPTS the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 22). Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Petitioner's § 2241 petition. (D.E. 1). The Court will enter final judgment separately. 1/2

DAVI ORALES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Signed: Corpus Chijsti, Texas AprifZ2™ 2026 2/2