

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

Katina Carmell Brown,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	C/A No.: 3:12-cv-2961-TLW
)	
SDH Education East LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, Katina Carmell Brown (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this employment discrimination action on November 12, 2012 against her employer, SDH Education East LLC (“Defendant”), pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. (“Title VII”). (Doc. #1).

Following careful review of the initial Report and Recommendation and other motions and memoranda filed in this matter (Doc. #25), this Court entered an Order on July 12, 2013 granting Plaintiff’s motion to amend her complaint, rendering the Defendant’s first motion to dismiss moot. (Doc. #30). An Amended Complaint was filed by Plaintiff on August 8, 2013. (Doc. #34). The Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint on August 22, 2013. (Doc. #38).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the instant Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) issued on December 13, 2013 by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). (Doc. #43). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Defendant’s motion to dismiss the Amended

Complaint and dismiss this case in its entirety. (See Doc. #43). The Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. The deadline for Plaintiff to file objections expired on December 30, 2013.¹ (See Doc. #43).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of 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, 719 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed de novo the Report and Recommendation (Doc. #43), as well as all other relevant filings in this matter. After careful consideration, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. #43) be and hereby is **ACCEPTED**.

Therefore, the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Doc. #38) is **GRANTED**. The above-captioned case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

February 3, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina

¹ The Report and Recommendation (Doc. #43) was mailed to the Plaintiff at the mailing address she provided to the Court on December, 13, 2013. (Doc. #44). The mail was not returned.