UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

William T. Coleman, Plaintiff, vs. Town of Mount Pleasant Police Department, and Officer Thomas Plyler, Defendant.	)	C/A No. 2:17-920-JFA-SVH ORDER

The *pro se* plaintiff was a pretrial detainee at the Charleston County Detention Center. He brought that action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action[1] has prepared a Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that this court should dismiss the action for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on May 15, 2017. However, the

[1] The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. 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 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

plaintiff did not file objections and the time within which to do so has now expired. In addition, the Report mailed to the plaintiff was returned to the Clerk's Office by the U.S. Postmaster as "Unable to forward." In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Magistrate Judge has allowed the plaintiff ample time to respond to the court's orders and the plaintiff has failed to do so. This court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that the petitioner meets all of the criteria for dismissal under Rule 41(b). See *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), *Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

Accordingly, this action is dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with the court's orders.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge

June 23, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina