

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

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Darvin Allen, #233800, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | C.A. No. 3:10-939-HMH-JRM |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | OPINION & ORDER |
| |) | |
| South Carolina Department of |) | |
| Corrections, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Darvin Allen (“Allen”), a state prisoner, proceeding pro se, seeks injunctive relief under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (“RLUIPA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc et seq.² In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge McCrorey recommends granting the Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.

Allen filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District 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 Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

² Allen’s other claims, a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim and a RLUIPA claim for monetary damages, were dismissed in a June 6, 2011 order.

accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation 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).

Upon review, the court finds that Allen's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McCrorey's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment, docket number 46, is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
May 10, 2012

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.