

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

James H. Singletary,)	C/A NO. 0:11-543-CMC-PJG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
Assistant Warden Fallen; Doctor Blocker;)	
Administrator Rosario, all in their)	
individual capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

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 Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On January 17, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and this matter dismissed with prejudice. 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 January 31, 2012.

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 conducting a *de novo* review as to objections made, and considering the record, 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 argues, *inter alia*, that the Magistrate Judge overlooked an affidavit attached to his opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, that he disagrees that negligence is not actionable in a *Bivens* action, that he "require[s]" care that is not available in prison, Obj. at 5, and that he has established evidence of deliberate indifference by Dr. Blocker. *See generally* Objections (ECF No. 47, filed Jan. 31, 2012). These objections, however, fail to undermine the legal and factual soundness of the Report. Therefore, they are without merit.

Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this matter is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
February 3, 2012