Grimes v. Byars et al Doc. 67

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

William Grimes, Plaintiff, v. William R. Byars, Jr., SCDC Director; Mary Simpson, Director ICS Program; Kevin Moore, Assistant Director ICS Program; Patricia Jones, ICS Counselor Individually, Defendants.	)	C/A No. 0:12-1244-TMC **ORDER**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of the 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 ("Report").

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 objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Dockets.Justia.com

On December 19, 2012, the Defendants moved for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 53.) The Plaintiff was advised of his right to respond to the Defendants' motion on December 20, 2012, (Dkt. No. 55), and again on January 31, 2013 (Dkt. No. 60). Additionally, the Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The Plaintiff still failed to respond.

Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report, recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. (Dkt. No. 63.) The Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (Dkt. No. 63 at 3). However, the Plaintiff did not file objections.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead 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) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 63) and incorporates it herein. It appears the Plaintiff no longer wishes to prosecute this action. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). *See Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989). It is further **ORDERED** that the

Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 53) is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina
March 13, 2013

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.