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

HSBC Mortgage Services, Inc.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Case No.: 3:17-cv-1656-TLW
v.	)	
	)	
Alice Felder-Lucas,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

ORDER

Defendant Alice Felder-Lucas, proceeding *pro se*, removed this case on June 23, 2017. ECF No. 1. This matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed on June 30, 2017, by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), (D.S.C.). ECF No. 8. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court remand this case because there is no federal subject matter jurisdiction. *Id.* The deadline for filing objections to the Report was July 14, 2017. On July 5, 2017, Defendant filed a Motion for Temporary Injunction. ECF No. 10.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In conducting its review, 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. Housing Auth. of the 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 the Report and the relevant filings. The Court concludes that Defendant has not presented evidence of federal subject matter jurisdiction in the removal documents or in the subsequent filings.[1] Therefore, after careful consideration, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report, ECF No. 8, is **ACCEPTED**, and the case is hereby **REMANDED** to the Richland County Court of Common Pleas.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

August 15, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina

[1] As stated above, the deadline for filing objections to the Report was July 14, 2017. The Court notes that Defendant did not file objections to the Report. To the extent that the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order could be construed as objections, Defendant does not address the Report and does not present evidence of subject matter jurisdiction in her filing. *See* ECF No. 10.