

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael A. Kohn,)	C/A No. 3:10-784-JFA-JRM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Captain Kevin Coleman,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Michael A. Kohn, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that his constitutional rights were violated when he was an inmate at the Turbeville Correctional Institution of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. Specifically, the plaintiff alleges that while his dorm was on cell restriction, he was not allowed to attend religious services.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the defendant’s motion for summary judgment² should be granted. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

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 and Recommendation 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. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

² An order was issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff responded to the motion after the court issued an order inquiring as to whether he wished to continue to prosecute the action.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on May 4, 2011. However, the plaintiff failed to file any objections. 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).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. The Report is incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, the defendant's motion for summary judgment is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 6, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina



Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge