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

John Allen Dixon, Jr., #289945,	)	C/A No.: 3:11-cv-02976-JFA
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Sheriff Bruce M. Bryant; Chief Ass. Admin. Richard L. Martin, Jr.; Chief Admin. James F. Arwood; Cpt. Gary Davies; Sgt. K. Millian; Lt. W. Plemmons; Ofc. D.T. Stewart,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, John Allen Dixon, Jr., brings this civil action against the named defendants. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Stewart verbally abused him. (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant Stewart later assisted other officers in removing the plaintiff from the shower. (ECF No. 1). 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

[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).

dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Report sets forth 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 December 6, 2011. However, the plaintiff failed to file 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, this action is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



January 24, 2012
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge