

Ian J. Dickson, ) C.A. No. 2:09-2539-PMD  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. ) ORDER  
)  
Porter Wiley, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
)

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. Thomas v Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.

<sup>1</sup>Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02 D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is hereby **ordered** that plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction is **denied**. The case is referred back to Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for further proceedings.

**ORDERED**, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY  
United States District Judge

July 9, 2010  
Charleston, South Carolina