



*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). 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).

In light of the standards set forth above, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the entire record, including, in particular, the Report and Plaintiff’s Objection. The Court concludes that none of Plaintiff’s objections supply fact or argument to meaningfully counter the reasoned conclusion of the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint fails to allege any non-frivolous, actionable federal claims.

For the forgoing reasons, the Court concurs with the reasoning of the Magistrate Judge and adopts the Report and incorporates it herein by reference, (ECF No. 14), overruling Plaintiff’s Objection. (ECF No. 18). Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint is thereby **DISMISSED** *without* prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

May 18, 2016  
Columbia, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.