

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

Akeen Alin-Nafir Abdullah-Malik,) Civil Action No.: 1:16-cv-00053-RBH
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) **ORDER**
)
 Cecila Reynolds, *Warden*; Jessica Edwards;)
 Beth Tidwell; and Catherine Amason,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the above-captioned Defendants. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R & R) of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). *See* R & R, ECF No. 51. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss this case with prejudice. R & R at 2, 12.

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 this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No parties have filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the

¹ Plaintiff's objections to the R & R were originally due by June 8, 2017. *See* ECF No. 51. On June 6, 2017, the Court issued a Text Order granting Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file objections and allowing him to file objections by June 28, 2017. *See* ECF No. 54. Plaintiff was served with the Text Order by mail, so his

absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct 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’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 51] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 37] and **DISMISSES** this case *with prejudice*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
July 25, 2017

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

objections were technically due by July 5, 2017 (June 28 was a Wednesday, and the Court was closed on July 3 and 4). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). However, Plaintiff still has not filed objections.