

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

Nationstar Mortgage LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

Marcus L. Hall; Rosa C. Hall; Deer Lake  
Homeowners Association,

Defendant.

C/A No. 3:17-1499-JFA

**ORDER**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Marcus L. Hall filed a notice of removal which purports to remove Civil Action No. 2015-CP-40-07210 from the Richland County Court of Common Pleas. (ECF No. 1). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this case was referred to the Magistrate Judge.

After reviewing the pleadings, the Magistrate Judge assigned to this action<sup>1</sup> prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation (“Report”) sua sponte and opines that this case should be remanded to the Richland County Court of Common Pleas for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 8). The Report sets forth, in detail, the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge’s review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

and this Court incorporates those facts and standards without a recitation. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on June 29, 2017. (ECF No. 12). Thus, this matter is ripe for review.

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 recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, a district court is only required to conduct a de novo review of the specific portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which an objection is made. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Carniewski v. W. Virginia Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 974 F.2d 1330 (4th Cir. 1992). In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Report of the Magistrate, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

## **II. DISCUSSION**

Here, Hall has made various vague and incoherent statements that fail to respond to the Report or specifically reference any findings of fact or conclusions of law. Hall merely states that "I am objecting to the Report and Recommendation dated 15 June 2017." (ECF No. 12 p. 1). In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Report of the Magistrate, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Therefore, the Report is adopted.

Additionally, Hall attempts to submit an "amended complaint for removal" to "help clarify the deficiencies." (ECF No. 12 p. 1). A review of this proposed amended complaint indicates that Hall has again failed to allege any facts that show this court has jurisdiction over this matter. (ECF No. 12-1). Moreover, the amended complaint fails to remedy any deficiencies identified in the Report. Accordingly, Hall's objections are without merit.

### III. CONCLUSION

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, as well as the Report, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8) and Remands this case back to the Richland County Court of Common Pleas. Additionally, all remaining pending motions are terminated as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 17, 2017  
Columbia, South Carolina



Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.  
United States District Judge