

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

Tyrone Lucas,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
Lieutenant Cynthia M. Ruth; Jon Ozmint,)
Director of the South Carolina)
Department of Corrections; Gregory)
Knowlin, Warden of Turbeville)
Correctional Institution; Angela Brown,)
Disciplinary Hearing Officer,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

C/A No.: 1:10-2465-TLW-SVH

ORDER

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 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 the complaint (Doc. # 1) and the amended complaint (Doc. # 1-5) in the above-captioned case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance of service of process. (Doc. # 13). The plaintiff has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 15).

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 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. # 13); plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 15); and the complaint (Doc. # 1) and the amended complaint (Doc. # 1-5) in the above-captioned case are **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

May 13, 2011
Florence, South Carolina