

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
ELKINS**

SHARIFF A. ROMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

**Civil Action No. 2:14-CV-43
(BAILEY)**

WARDEN R.A. PERDUE,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble [Doc. 20]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Trumble for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Trumble filed his R&R on July 22, 2015 [Doc. 20]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny and dismiss with prejudice the petitioner's § 2241 petition.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to 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. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo*

review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Originally, objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). However, this Court granted the petitioner a lengthy extension of time to file objections by November 10, 2015. Nevertheless, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the **Report and Recommendation [Doc. 20]** should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, the Petitioner's Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 **[Doc. 1]** is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Clerk is directed to enter separate judgment in favor of the respondent. This matter is further **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court.

As a final matter, upon an independent review of the record, this Court hereby **DENIES** the petitioner a certificate of appealability, finding that he has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: November 12, 2015.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE