

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

Karen Moore,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 Judge Kristi Lea Harrington; Caroline)
 Leonard; Bonnie L. Campbell, J.C.)
 Nicholson, Jr.; and Charleston County,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

No. 2:13-cv-3033-RMG

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (R & R) of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 13), recommending that this action be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance of service. For the reasons stated below, the Court **ADOPTS** the R & R in full. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service.

Background


Plaintiff brought this Section 1983 action against two South Carolina state court judges, two employees of the Charleston County Clerk of Court’s office, and Charleston County. (Dkt. No. 1.) Plaintiff alleges, among other things, that the Defendants have violated her “First Amendment right to bring a grievance to the government.” (*Id.* at 1.) The Magistrate Judge recommended that this action be summarily dismissed because Defendants Nicholson and Harrington are entitled absolute judicial immunity, Defendants Leonard and Campbell are entitled to quasi judicial immunity, and Plaintiff has failed to state a cause of action against Charleston County. (Dkt. No. 13.) Plaintiff did not file an objection to the Magistrate Judge’s R & R.

Discussion

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)); accord Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). However, where no objection is made, as is the case here, this Court “must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Id.* (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee note). Moreover, in the absence of specific objections to the R & R, the Court need not give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s analysis and recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Complaint and the R & R and concludes that the Magistrate Judge correctly applied the relevant law to the operative facts in this matter. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** in full the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 13) as the order of this Court. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge

January ¹², 2014
Charleston, South Carolina