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

John S. Stritzinger; Greenville Associates; Capital Technology Services, Plaintiffs, vs. Federal Communications Commission; United States Government; U.S. Attorney's Office; Verizon; Cisco Systems, Defendants.	)	Case No. 3:16-1136-TLW

ORDER

On April 11, 2016, Plaintiff John S. Stritzinger,[1] proceeding *pro se*, brought this action against Defendants Federal Communications Commission, United States Government, U.S. Attorney's Office, Verizon, and Cisco Systems. (ECF No. 1). On the same day, Plaintiff filed a motion construed as a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (ECF No. 2). On May 6, 2016, United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), issued an Order directing Plaintiff, *inter alia*, to bring the case into proper form by filing the necessary service documents, and by either paying the filing fee or providing sufficient information to make a determination of indegency. (ECF No. 8). Subsequently, Plaintiff filed four motions.[2] Despite

[1] Plaintiff Stritzinger is a self-represented litigant. Plaintiff Greenville Associates and Plaintiff Capital Technology Services were named but never appeared in this case.

[2] Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Review Medical Findings" (ECF No. 10), "Motion to Amend/Correct Compliant" (ECF No. 16), "Motion for Permanent Injunction" (ECF No. 17), and "Motion for Electronic Filing" (ECF No. 18).

the Court's warning that failure to comply with the Proper Form Order, (ECF No. 8), could result in the dismissal of his case, these filings failed to bring the action into proper form.

On June 13, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (the "Report") recommending that this Court dismiss this action without prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to comply fully with the Orders of the Court. (ECF No. 23). Plaintiff filed timely Objections to the Report on June 30, 2016. (ECF No. 25).

This matter is now before the Court for review of the Magistrate Judge's Report. In reviewing the Report, the Court applies the following standard:

> The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the Objections. For the reasons stated in the Report, Plaintiff Greenville Associates and Plaintiff Capital Technology Services are **DISMISSED** as plaintiffs in this case. After an appropriate review, the Report is **ACCEPTED** and the Plaintiff's Objections are **OVERRULED**. Plaintiff's Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service of process for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge, and all remaining pending motions are **TERMINATED AS MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

August 11, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina