

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

Christopher James France In Propria Persona,

Plaintiff,

v.

James G. Mackey, acting as CFO for Freddie Mac, and Joseph P. Sheridan, Jr., acting as COO for HomeBridge Financial Services, Inc.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:20-2424-BHH

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff’s pro se action alleging various causes of action purportedly related to a mortgage on his property. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On October 7, 2020, Magistrate Judge Molly H. Cherry issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”), addressing the various pending motions and recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff’s motion to remand, motion to enforce, and motion for judicial notices (ECF Nos. 19, 24, and 25, respectively), and that the Court grant Defendants’ motion to dismiss. Attached to the Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file specific, written objections to the Report within fourteen days of receiving a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

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. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are 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). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident 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 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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s thorough analysis.

Accordingly, the Court adopts and specifically incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 30); the Court denies Plaintiff’s motion to remand (ECF No. 19), motion to enforce (ECF No. 24), and motion for judicial notice (ECF No. 25); the Court grants Defendants’ motion to dismiss (ECF No. 17); and Plaintiff’s complaint is hereby dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

October 30, 2020
Charleston, South Carolina