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

James Lee McCoy, Sr.,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-00369-JMC
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	**ORDER**
	)	
Anthony Davis, Sumter County Sheriff; Deputy E. Boland; and Deputy Williams,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff brought this action seeking relief, pursuant to "the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 1985 and § 2000 cc and the laws and Constitution of the State of South Carolina." (ECF No. 1.) This matter is before the court for review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") (ECF No. 8), filed on June 19, 2017, recommending that Plaintiff's action, (ECF No. 1), be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. 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 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 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 June 16, 2017. (ECF No. 8.) 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 waiver 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 and does not contain clear error. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8). It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's action, (ECF No. 1), be **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

J. Michelle Childs

United States District Judge

July 18, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina