

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Keith Edward Kasyjanski,

Petitioner,

vs.

Harriet Squirewell,

Respondent.

C/A No. 1:24-cv-4216-JFA

ORDER

Plaintiff Keith Edward Kasyjanski (Petitioner), a self-represented, former pretrial detainee¹, brings this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 against Harriet Squirewell (Respondent). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), the case was referred to the Magistrate Judge for pretrial proceedings.

On July 30, 2024, petitioner filed his petition concerning the validity of his detainment at Fairfield County Detention Center. (ECF No. 1). On August 19, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a proper form order, identifying several deficiencies in the petition. (ECF No. 8). The proper form order directed Petitioner to correct the deficiencies by September 9, 2024, and warned Petitioner that failing to do so may result in dismissal of his case. (ECF No. 8). Petitioner failed to correct the deficiencies. Subsequently, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Report), concluding that this Court should dismiss Petitioner's case because (1) the petition is moot; (2) the petition

¹ When Petitioner filed his Petition, he was a pretrial detainee at Fairfield County Detention Center. Plaintiff has since been discharged pursuant to a state court order specifying methods and conditions of release. (ECF No 16).

erroneously requests the Court to interfere with state criminal proceedings; and (3) Petitioner failed to prosecute his case. (ECF No. 17, pgs. 5-8). The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of his right to object to the Report by October 4, 2024. (ECF No. 17, pg. 10). However, Petitioner did not file objections and the time to do so has expired. Therefore, this matter is ripe for review.

A district court is only required to conduct a *de novo* review of the specific portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which an objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Carniewski v. W. Virginia Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 974 F.2d 1330 (4th Cir. 1992). In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Magistrate's Report, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Here, Plaintiff failed to raise any objections to the Report and therefore this Court is not required to explain its decision to adopt the recommendation. A review of the Report and prior orders indicates that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that Petitioner's petition is subject to dismissal.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. (ECF No. 17). Consequently, this action is dismissed without leave for further amendment and without requiring the respondent to file a return.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 23, 2024
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