

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION

A.K.B.,	:	
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No. 4:25-cv-71-CDL-AGH
	:	28 U.S.C. § 2241
TERRENCE DICKERSON,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

RECOMMENDATION OF DISMISSAL

On February 24, 2025, Petitioner filed a *pro se* application for federal habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 1). Petitioner failed to pay the filing fee, so the Clerk issued a notice of deficiency instructing Petitioner that he must either pay the filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) within twenty-one days. The notice of deficiency was returned to the Court as undeliverable with a notation that Petitioner was no longer at Stewart Detention Center. *See* Mail Returned, ECF No. 3. The time for compliance passed without any contact from Petitioner, so Petitioner was ordered to show cause within fourteen days why his petition should not be dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee. Order, Apr. 8, 2025, ECF No. 4.

On April 29, 2025, the Order to Show Cause was also returned to the Court as undeliverable with a notation that Petitioner was not at Stewart Detention Center. *See* Mail Returned, ECF No. 5. The Court has been unable to locate Petitioner through a public records search. Without an address for Petitioner, this case cannot

proceed. Further, Petitioner has not paid the required filing fee or filed a motion to proceed IFP or shown cause as to why his petition should not be dismissed. It is therefore recommended that this case be dismissed without prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (allowing for involuntary dismissal for a plaintiff's failure to comply with a court order).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Petitioner may serve and file written objections to this Recommendation, or seek an extension of time to file objections, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy hereof. Any objection should be no longer than TWENTY (20) PAGES in length. *See* M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.4. The district judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the Recommendation to which objection is made. All other portions of the Recommendation may be reviewed for clear error.

Petitioner is notified that, pursuant to Eleventh Circuit Rule 3-1, “[a] party failing to object to a magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations contained in a report and recommendation in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to challenge on appeal the district court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions if the party was informed of the time period for objecting and the consequences on appeal for failing to object. In the absence of a proper objection, however, the court may review on appeal for plain error if necessary in the interests of justice.”

SO RECOMMENDED, this 5th day of May, 2025.

s/ Amelia G. Helmick
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE