

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

RECEIVED  
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2009 SEP 24 P 2:51

Curtis Q. Owens, #184674, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
Charleston City Police Dept.; City of )  
Charleston; Pvt. NFN Inabinett, #1412; Cpl. )  
NFN Emmanuel, #1036; Pvt. NFN Shealy, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

C.A. No. 0:08-02380-TLW-RSC

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Curtis Q. Owens (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1): The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on September 19, 2008. (Doc. #19).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Robert S. Carr to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #57). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court deny the defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismiss the defendants’ motion to stay discovery as moot. (Doc. #57). The defendants filed objections to the Report. (Doc. #61). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny

entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #57). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion for summary judgment, (Doc. #19), is denied, and the defendants' motion to stay discovery, (Doc. #37), is denied as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

September 23, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina