IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA		RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
Terrence Bennett, #270610, Plaintiff,	) ) C/A No. 2:10-0762-MBS )	2010 JUN 10 P 12: 28  DISTRICT COURT CHARLESTON. SC
vs.  Georgetown County Detention Center, Mr. Baker, Mr. Pierson, Director Lane Cribb, Major Martin, Captain Ms. Wineglass,	ORDER ) ) )	
Defendants.	) _) _)	

Plaintiff Terrence Bennett is an inmate in custody of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a complaint on March 25, 2010. At the time of the underlying complaint, Plaintiff was a pretrial detainee housed at the Georgetown County Detention Center. Plaintiff asserts that Defendants violated his constitutional rights in various respects. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr for pretrial handling. The Magistrate Judge reviewed the complaint pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. On April 8, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation in which he determined that Defendant Georgetown County Detention Center, as a group of buildings or a facility, is not a "person" subject to suit under § 1983. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that Defendant Georgetown County Detention Center be summarily dismissed. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on April 19, 2010.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has

no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court.

Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or

in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the

Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff contends that the Georgetown County Detention Center is insured by the state

government and therefore is subject to providing coverage for his alleged damages. However, as the

Magistrate Judge properly noted, a § 1983 claim must be brought against a "person" and not an

inanimate object. Plaintiff's objection is without merit.

The court has thoroughly reviewed the record and Report and Recommendation. The court

adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. Plaintiff's § 1983

complaint is summarily dismissed as to Defendant Georgetown County Detention Center without

prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The within matter is recommitted to the

Magistrate Judge for further pretrial handling.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour

United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina

June 9, 2010.

2