IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Steven Samuel, Plaintiff, vs. Warden G. Nolland/ AW Richard Cothran; et al, Defendants.	C.A. No. 2:11-3417-PMD **ORDER**

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with this Court's Order of Reference and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Because plaintiff is pro se, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.[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 judge's report.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is herewith

ORDERED that defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** and the case is dismissed with prejudice.

---

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

January 30, 2013
Charleston, South Carolina