

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

Brian LeKeith Turner, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Deputy Major Leso; Sgt. John Clayton; )  
 Nurse Roach; Nurse Practitioner Shana )  
 Peeler; Medical Director Kathy White; )  
 Deputy Van-Vleck; Deputy Peeler; )  
 Deputy Bridges; Nurse Mary Jane; )  
 Doctor John Doe; Nurse Pilvyeva; )  
 Medical Staff John Doe; Captain )  
 Hayes; Captain Hollifield, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No. 0:24-cv-1389-BHH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Brian LeKeith Turner’s pro se (“Plaintiff”) complaint. In accordance with Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On July 1 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation (“Report”), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint without prejudice. (ECF No. 20.) In her Report, the Magistrate Judge explained that Plaintiff has failed to comply with her prior order instructing Plaintiff to bring his case into proper form and has otherwise failed to prosecute this case.

Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The

recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. **Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 20) and summarily dismisses this action without prejudice for failure to prosecute.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

July 25, 2024  
Charleston, South Carolina