

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

George Holmes, #289114, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Evans CI Medical, Doctor/Nurses, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No. 2:11-0538-SB

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint relating to medical treatment he has received at the Evans Correctional Institution, filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In his complaint, the Plaintiff indicates that he has filed a grievance but that he has not received a final answer. He states that he is concerned about his swollen feet and his right leg, and that he is having difficulty walking, dizziness, pain, and difficulty breathing.


Pursuant to local rule, this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge. On March 16, 2011, after reviewing the Plaintiff's complaint, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") finding that although the Plaintiff raised facially-cognizable claims, "Evans CI Medical, Doctor/Nurses" is not an identifiable person subject to service of process and is not a proper defendant under section 1983. Based on this failure, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court dismiss this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of his right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 14 days of being served with a copy. Despite this notice, no objections have been filed.

Absent 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. Shriners's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of any portion of the R&R. After a review of the record, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Accordingly, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the R&R (Entry 12) is adopted, and the Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sol Blatt, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

April 20, 2011  
Charleston, South Carolina

#2