

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

Landis Allen Moragne, #302976,)	
)	Civil Action No. 1:15-1010-TMC-SVH
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Cecilia Reynolds, Warden of Lee)	
Correctional Institution; Ass. Warden)	
Sharp; Deputy Warden Nolan;)	
John Doe One; John Doe Two; and)	
Not None Deais,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff also filed a motion to amend his complaint. (ECF No. 18). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., these matters were referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that Plaintiff’s motion to amend his complaint (ECF No. 18) be denied to the extent that he seeks to add South Carolina Department of Corrections’ (“SCDC”) Director Bryan P. Stirling as a Defendant. (ECF No. 31). Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 31 at 4). Plaintiff, however, filed no objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but

instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the magistrate judge's Report (ECF No. 31) and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion to amend his complaint (ECF No. 18) be **DENIED to the extent that he seeks to add SCDC Director Bryan P. Stirling as a Defendant.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

September 21, 2015
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.