

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

RECEIVED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT, CHARLESTON, SC
2010 OCT 20 A 10: 04

Edwin Reeves Hazel, III,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Captain C. McElvogue, et. al.,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

Case No. 2:09-cv-3276-RMG

ORDER

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge’s recommendation. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).¹


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). No objections have been filed to the magistrate’s report.

Absent a timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge’s factual or legal conclusions. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *Wells v. Shriner’s Hosp.*, 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the parties did not file any specific, written objections, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review of any portion of the report and recommendation. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge’s R&R (Dkt. No. 46) as the Order of this Court, and it is

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to the Court.

ORDERED that Defendants' summary judgment motion be denied as premature with leave to refile the motion following a reasonable time for further discovery regarding which, if any, grievance procedures were available to Plaintiff.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge

October 20, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina