Taylor v. Gardner et al Doc. 13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENWOOD DIVISION

Henry Taylor, # 439, 444,) C/A NO. 8:09-2605-CMC-BHH
Plaintiff,)) OPINION and ORDER
V.	
Wesley J. Gardner, Investigator; County of Sumter, Third Judicial Circuit,)))
Defendants.)))

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On November 18, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on November 30, 2009.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28

U.S.C. § 636(b).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff's objections, the court agrees with the

conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and

Recommendation by reference in this Order.

Plaintiff contends that his complaint should be served, maintaining that his constitutional

rights "were indeed violated" and complaining of alleged delay and infirmities in the state's

prosecution. Objections at 1, 2 (Dkt. # 11, filed Nov. 30, 2009). However, these conclusory

assertions and disagreements with the manner in which the state's criminal prosecution may be

proceeding are insufficient to overcome the legal infirmities of Plaintiff's complaint. Therefore,

Plaintiff's objections are without merit.

This matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie

CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina

December 4, 2009

C:\Documents and Settings\nac60\Desktop\09-2605 Order.wpd

2