

plaintiff failed to file objections and the deadline within which to do so has expired. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Magistrate Judge opines that under the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), plaintiff's claim for damages is barred where success of the action would implicitly question the validity of the conviction or duration of the sentence, unless the prisoner can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has been successfully challenged. The Supreme Court also extended the holding in *Heck* to a prisoner's claim for damages regarding loss of good time credits, as the plaintiff contends here. *See Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641, 648 (1997); *Muhammad v. Close*, 540 U.S. 749, 751 (2004). Moreover, the plaintiff has not demonstrated that his institutional conviction has been reversed, expunged, or declared invalid by a state court, and no federal writ has been issued. Thus, plaintiff's § 1983 due process claim is barred by the holdings of *Heck* and *Edwards*.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. The Report is adopted and incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 4, 2013
Columbia, South Carolina

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joseph F. Anderson, Jr." in a cursive style.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge