

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

Travis Mandell Kemp,	)	C.A. No. 1:09-3195-TLW_SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
-versus-	)	ORDER
	)	
Officer Johnson; Major Phillip Anderson;	)	
Cpt. Sharon Middleton; Lt. Luke Lark; and	)	
Officer Brooks,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The Plaintiff has brought this *pro se* action against the Defendants under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva v. Hodges, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In her Report, Magistrate Judge Hodges recommends that Defendants’ motion to file an Answer out of time (Doc. # 27) be granted. (Doc. # 44). The Report further notes that if this Court accepts this recommendation, Plaintiff’s motions for default judgment (Doc. # 21, # 26) will be rendered moot. The Plaintiff has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 49).<sup>1</sup>

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

---

<sup>1</sup>Although this filing is captioned in part as objections to the Report, the body of the filing appears to request an appointment of counsel. Plaintiff has already filed a motion to appoint counsel (Doc. # 32) which was denied by the magistrate judge by Order filed January 12, 2011. (Doc. # 41). To the extent that this is an additional motion to appoint counsel, this motion is DENIED for the reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge’s January 12, 2011 Order

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 this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 44); Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 49); and Defendants' motion to file an Answer out of time (Doc. # 27) is **GRANTED**. In light of this ruling, Plaintiff's motions for default judgment (Doc. # 21, # 26) are **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
**TERRY L. WOOTEN**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

February 3, 2011  
Florence, South Carolina