

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

## ORDER

Harold Anderson, (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 20, 2010. (Doc. # 1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Robert S. Carr, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court dismiss the complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. # 8). Objections were initially due by December 17, 2010. Plaintiff’s mail was returned as undeliverable. On December 17, 2010, entry was made by the clerk of court giving notice of change of address in the form of a new case filing received with a new address from the plaintiff. The plaintiff’s deadline to file objections was extended to January 4, 2011. The plaintiff filed no objections to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation 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. In the absence of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 8). Therefore, the complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

January 21, 2011  
Florence, South Carolina