

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Dion Orlando Taylor,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 0:10-50-HMH-PJG
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>OPINION AND ORDER</b>
	)	
John Ozmint, Director, in his official and	)	
individual capacity; Lt. John Mitchell, in his	)	
individual capacity; Lt. Jim Gibson, in his	)	
individual capacity; Bernard McKie,	)	
Warden, in his official and individual	)	
capacity,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

The parties filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation, 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 must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Gossett’s Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

**ORDERED** that the Defendants’ motion to dismiss, docket number 14, is denied as to the excessive force claim against Defendants Gibson and Mitchell and granted as to all other claims. It is further

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction, docket number 25, is denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
January 27, 2011

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.