

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

Shawn Michael Robinson,	)	C/A NO. 3:13-73-CMC-SVH
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
v.	)	
	)	
SC Dept of Mental Health; Dwight Green;	)	
Robert Vick; Leonard Ramsey;	)	
SC Public Safety Officers Lt. Rosalind	)	
Dendy; Cpl. Jarvis Borum; Invest James M.	)	
Koons; SCDMH Security Officers Eric	)	
Rotenberry; Benjamin Williams,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s complaint which raises, *inter alia*, claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(e), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”).<sup>1</sup> On December 20, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants Dendy and the South Carolina Department of Mental Health be dismissed from this matter without prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Report and the time for doing so has expired.

---

<sup>1</sup>Magistrate Judge McCrorey has retired and this matter is now assigned to Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges.

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. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a 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 to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusion of the Report. Accordingly, Defendants Rosalind Dendy and the South Carolina Department of Mental Health are dismissed from this action without prejudice.

This matter is re-referred to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
January 30, 2014