

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

Dexter Antonio Sheppard, #312344,)	C/A NO. 1:10-2424-CMC-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
Warden Tim Riley and Sgt. Derrick)	
McBryar,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On November 4, 2011, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and that the complaint be dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on November 22, 2011.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is

made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

After conducting a *de novo* review as to objections made, and considering the record, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff's objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order.

Plaintiff's objections are a recitation of his contentions relating to the purported facts of this matter, and do not specifically address his failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies relating to the issues raised in the complaint regarding the alleged use of excessive force on April 14, 2010. Therefore, Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this matter is dismissed *without prejudice* for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *See Bryant v. Rich*, 530 F.3d 1368, 1375 n.11 (11th Cir. 2008) (noting that district court's dismissal without prejudice on summary judgment motion proper where "neither party has evidenced that administrative remedies at [the correctional facility] are absolutely time barred or otherwise clearly infeasible.").¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
November 29, 2011

¹All other pending motions are hereby mooted by dismissal of this matter.