

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

James Gordon Gibson,	)	Civil Action No. 2:13-3134-MGL
	)	
	Plaintiff,	
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Director Holly Scaturro, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
	Defendants.	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff James Gordon Gibson, (“Plaintiff”), an inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed the instant action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for pre-trial handling.

On July 9, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, (“the Report”), (ECF No. 65), recommending that this Court grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 50). Plaintiff filed a timely Objection to the Report. (ECF No. 67). The matter is now ripe for review by this Court.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record

in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

In light of the standards set forth above, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the Plaintiff’s Objection. The Court finds that Plaintiff’s Objection consists almost exclusively of restatements of arguments already advanced in prior filings, coupled with inapposite legal citations, and does not advance specific, cogent objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report. No where in Plaintiff’s long, rambling filing does he meaningfully counter any of the core legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge’s thorough analysis.

For the forgoing reasons, the Court concurs with the reasoning of the Magistrate Judge and adopts the Report and incorporates it herein by reference, (ECF No. 65), overruling Plaintiff’s Objection. (ECF No. 67). Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, (ECF No. 50), is thereby **GRANTED.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

August 11, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina