

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

RECEIVED  
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2010 MAY 13 P 2:11

Jesse Quentin Boatwright, #307518, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
Warden Padula; and Associate )  
Warden Brooks, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No. 3:09-2545-SB

**ORDER**


This matter is before the Court upon the pro se Plaintiff's complaint, which was filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On April 13, 2010, United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court grant the Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 14 days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, after review, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Entry 13) as the Order of this Court, and it is

**ORDERED** that the Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Entry 9) is granted.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

The Honorable Sol Blatt, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

May 12, 2010  
Charleston, South Carolina

