

RECEIVED  
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2010 DEC 14 A 11:03

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

Adi Supreme God Allah, )  
#145078, aka Albert Jones, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
-versus- )

C. A. No. 2:09-2349-RMG-RSC

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Director Reginald I. Lloyd, )  
S.L.E.D.; James S. Sligh, )  
Jr., Headquarters; Ernest )  
Rowe, Record Processing, )  
Inmate Records Office; George )  
T. Hagan, Warden, Allendale )  
Correctional Institution; )  
Natalie H. Spires, S.L.E.D.; )  
Sakinah S. Mack, Inmates )  
Records Office; K. Hudson, )  
Classification Manager, )  
Allendale Correctional )  
Institution; R. Smith, )  
Classification Case Manager, )  
Allendale Correctional )  
Institution, in their )  
individual capacities, )  
 )  
Defendants. )

The pro se plaintiff brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. On September 30, 2010, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. By order of this court filed October 15, 2010, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the plaintiff was advised of the dismissal and summary judgment procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. On October 29, 2010, the Order was returned marked

Undeliverable and "Released". Despite this explanation, the plaintiff elected not to respond to the motion.

As the plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court filed a second order on November 22, 2010, giving the plaintiff an additional ten (10) days in which to file his response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action may be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute, Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978), 41(b) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. On December 13, 2010, this Order was returned marked undeliverable and "Released". The plaintiff did not respond.

The plaintiff has also failed to advise the court in writing of his current address as ordered by the court on September 28, 2009. Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert S. Carr  
United States Magistrate Judge

Charleston, South Carolina

December 13, 2010

## Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge 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 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within **fourteen (14) days** of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
P.O. Box 835  
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).