

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

Corey Antione Williams, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Warden Kenny Atkinson, )  
 )  
 Respondent. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

C/A No. 0:11-2057-TMC

**ORDER**

Petitioner, a federal prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), D.S.C., all pre-trial proceedings were referred to a Magistrate Judge. This matter is before the court on the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) filed in this action on May 9, 2012 recommending that the Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment be granted and the Petition be denied. (Dkt. # 24). The Magistrate Judge provided Petitioner a notice advising him of his right to file objections to the Report. (Dkt. # 24 at 10). Petitioner filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report on May 25, 2012. (Dkt. # 26).

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *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 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. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The court is obligated to conduct a *de novo* review of every portion of the Magistrate Judge’s report to which objections have been filed. *Id.* However, the court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not

direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge's conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment be granted and that the Petition be denied. As noted above, Plaintiff filed objections to the Report which the Court has carefully reviewed. However, the Plaintiff's objections provide no basis for this court to deviate from the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition. The objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report or merely restate Plaintiff's claims.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court finds Petitioner's objections are without merit. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. # 16) is **GRANTED** and the Petition is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

June 1, 2012  
Greenville, South Carolina

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

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, if applicable.