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

Quinton Brown, Plaintiff, v. Anthony Dennis, Sumter County Sheriff; Investigator Jennifer Thomas; S.C. Department of Juvenile Justice; Officer April Skinner; Thomas R. Mims, Jr.; Hampton Gardner; Robert Burnish; Jennie Daley; Wesley Gardner; Susan Oakes-Thomas; Edward Francis Brown; Willie McFadden; April Skinner McFadden; Krystle Skinner; and Shenequa Oaks, Defendants.	)	Civil Action No. 3:15-cv-03334-JMC **ORDER**

Plaintiff, Quinton Brown, who is represented by counsel, filed this action seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 & 1985, as well as state law claims, against the named defendants. (ECF No. 1.) This matter is before the court for review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") (ECF No. 34), filed on February 3, 2016, recommending that Defendant S.C. Department of Juvenile Justice's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 13) be granted and that Plaintiff's action (ECF No. 1) be dismissed. 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) 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 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 February 22, 2016. (ECF No. 34.) 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). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's wavier of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

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. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 34). It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant S.C. Department of Justice's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 13) be granted and that Plaintiff's action (ECF No.1) be **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED

United States District Judge

March 15, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina