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

Ronald Brunson, Plaintiff, vs. United States Department of Justice of Federal Bureau of Investigation; Federal Bureau of Investigation, Defendants.	)	C/A No.: 3:11-cv-2659-JFA ORDER

The *pro se* plaintiff, Ronald Brunson, brings this civil action against the named defendants. As noted by the Magistrate Judge, "[p]laintiff's Complaint is disjointed, vague, and appears on its face to be comprised of delusional allegations." (ECF No. 8). In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he was issued a 42 million dollar check but that the FBI stopped the check because it was "allege I was doing still Masturbation." (*See* ECF No. 7 at 3–6). Plaintiff filed this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action[1] has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the plaintiff's complaint should be summarily dismissed without service of process pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Report sets forth

[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).

in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on October 24, 2011. Plaintiff filed an Objection to Report and Recommendation on November 8, 2011. He also filed a letter regarding a settlement offer on November 23, 2011.

In her Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this court dismiss this case for the following reasons: (1) Plaintiff's Complaint is factually frivolous; (2) this court cannot grant clemency for state or federal crimes; (3) the plaintiff has sought monetary relief from defendants who are immune from such claims; (4) if this case is a *Bivens* action,[2] a *Bivens* action may not be brought against agencies of the United States; (5) if this case has been brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), the defendants are entitled to summary dismissal on the basis of sovereign immunity.

In his Objection, the plaintiff raises a variety of issues, but he fails to address any of the reasons that the Magistrate Judge gives for recommending that his case be summarily dismissed. For example, he asked the court to investigate various documents, and he provided the court with letters that he has received from various sectors of the government in response to his correspondence. (*See* ECF No. 11, 11-8). Plaintiff also reiterates factual allegations that he has previously made to this court. (*See* ECF No. 11-

[2] *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) (establishing a direct cause of action under the United States Constitution against federal officials for the violation of federal constitutional rights.

4). However, he fails to raise any issue that could rectify the many deficiencies of his case, which the Magistrate Judge details in her Report. Moreover, the plaintiff's Objection is comprised of more of the same "disjointed, vague, and . . . delusional" allegations that the Magistrate Judge noted in her Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff has not raised any specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, and in the absence of specific objections, this court is not required to given 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, this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



December 9, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District J