

Robert McDaniel Cox,) C.A. #2:11-2811-PMD
)
Plaintiff,)
)
)
vs.) **ORDER**
)
)
Bristow Marchant, David C. Norton,)
James A. Stuckey, and William J. Thrower,)
)
Defendants.)
)

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


A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this

Dockets.Justia.com

case and the applicable law. Finding no error in the report, this court adopts the report and recommendation and incorporates it into this order.

For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is hereby **ordered** that the within action is hereby **dismissed** without prejudice.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

November 22, 2011
Charleston, South Carolina