

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

Paul Lewis Richards,	)	Civil Action No.3:14-cv-04234-JMC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
v.	)	
	)	
Donald Robinson and Stephen Dauway,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, brought this action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012). (ECF No. 1.) This matter is before the court for review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (ECF No. 39), filed on December 9, 2015, recommending that:

- Defendant Stephen Dauway’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) be granted,
- Defendant Donald Robinson’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) on Plaintiff’s Fourth Amendment claims under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act be granted, and
- this matter be remanded as to Plaintiff’s claim for negligent deprivation of property against Defendant Donald Robinson.

The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge’s Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2012) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court, and the recommendation has no presumptive weight—the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this 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 objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file an objection to the Report "within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of the Report and Recommendation," or by December 29, 2015. (ECF No. 39.) Plaintiff filed no objections.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "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.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (*quoting* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law and that there is no clear error. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 39). It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant Stephen Dauway's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) be **GRANTED**, Defendant Donald Robinson's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 24) on Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment claims under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act be **GRANTED**, and this matter be **REMANDED** as to Plaintiff's claim for negligent deprivation of property against Defendant Donald Robinson.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*J. Michelle Childs*

United States District Judge

February 1, 2016  
Columbia, South Carolina