

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

Curtis Q. Owens, # 184674, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
Tim Riley, TRCI Warden; Gary Lane, )  
Assoc Warden; James Bates, "SMU" Lt; )  
Jerry Alexander, Cap SMU; Henery )  
McMasters, Attny Gen; Paul Brewton, )  
Maj & SLED Agent; Jon Ozmint, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No.: 0:09-1773-TLW-PJG

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Curtis Q. Owens ("plaintiff"), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). On November 20, 2010, the plaintiff filed a "Memo" that was docketed by the Clerk of Court as a motion for relocation. (Doc. #37). On April 14, 2010, the plaintiff filed a document captioned "Motion for Federal Protection and bench Letter to be Placed in Federal Holding Detention." (Doc. #77). This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Amended Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. #85). On June 10, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the plaintiff's motions, (Docs. #37, #77) be denied.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that the Magistrate Judge amended an earlier Report and Recommendation, (Doc. #81), to indicate recent changes in the procedural history of one of the cases cited in the Report and Recommendation.

(Doc. #85). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report.<sup>2</sup> Objections were due on June 28, 2010.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #85). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the plaintiff's motions, (Docs. #37, #77), are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

August 19, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina

---

<sup>2</sup>The Court does note that shortly after the filing of the original Report, the plaintiff filed a set of objections. (Doc. #84). However, these objections refer back to a previously filed Order of the Magistrate Judge, (Doc. #80), and do not appear to address the motions now before the Court. The Court has not considered these objections in conjunction with this Report. The Court has, however, conducted a *de novo* review of the plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge's Order, (Doc. #80), in accordance with the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). In reviewing objections to a nondispositive order of a Magistrate Judge under Rule 72(a), this Court will "modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law." After full review of the Magistrate Judge's Order, (Doc. #80), in conjunction with the plaintiff's objections, (Doc. #84), the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Order is well-reasoned and neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. For this reason, the plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge's prior Order are **OVERRULED**. (Doc. #84).