UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Sarah Pressey,	)	C/A No.: 1:18-1115-JFA-PJG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	**ORDER**
	)	
Lowes Home Center, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

Sarah Pressey ("Plaintiff"), proceeding *pro se*, originally filed this personal injury action against Lowes Home Center, LLC ("Defendant") in state court. Defendant removed this personal injury action from the Aiken County Court of Common Pleas.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action[1] has prepared a Report and Recommendation and opines that this action should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because Plaintiff has failed to respond to two orders issued by the Magistrate Judge. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the Court incorporates such without a recitation. By orders dated May 2, 2018 and July 3, 2018, the Magistrate Judge directed Plaintiff to submit fully completed and signed answers to the Court's interrogatories pursuant to Local Civil Rule 26.01 (D.S.C.). (ECF Nos. 11 & 17). In the Magistrate Judge's second order, Plaintiff was warned that her failure to comply with the

[1] The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. 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. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation 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 to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Magistrate Judge's two orders would result in the dismissal of her case. To date, Plaintiff has not only failed to comply with the Magistrate Judge's two orders, she has failed to provide any response.

Plaintiff was advised of her right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on September 7, 2018. (ECF No. 24). The Magistrate Judge required Plaintiff to file objections by September 21, 2018. *Id.* However, Plaintiff did not file any objections. 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).

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 incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, this action is dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure[1].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.

September 27, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge

[1] In light of the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge dismissed Defendant's Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order and Motion to Compel Discovery as moot. (ECF Nos. 20& 22).