

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Frank J. Washington,	)	Civil Action No.: 2:18-cv-00681-RBH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Detective Jennifer Butler,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, who recommends granting Defendant’s motion for summary judgment<sup>1</sup> and dismissing this case.<sup>2</sup> *See* ECF No. 50.

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 this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R 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 with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>3</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant filed the motion as a “Motion to Dismiss or in the Alternative Motion for Summary Judgment,” *see* ECF No. 39, and the Magistrate Judge treated it as one for summary judgment. *See* R & R at p. 2 n.2.

<sup>2</sup> The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.).

<sup>3</sup> Defendant’s objections were due by February 8, 2019, and Plaintiff’s objections were due by February 11, 2019. *See* ECF Nos. 50 & 51.

Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct 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’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts the Magistrate Judge’s R & R [ECF No. 50]. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 39] as to Plaintiff’s federal claims filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, **DECLINES** to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims, and **DISMISSES** this action.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
February 25, 2019

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge