

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

Jerrick Andre Brown,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 City of Florence Police Dep't, Gerald)
 Cameron, individually and/or in his official)
 capacity, and Michael Swaringer,)
 individually and/or in his official capacity,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

Civil Action No.: 4:07-cv-1613

ORDER

On June 8, 2007, the plaintiff, Jerrick Andre Brown (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this action alleging claims for false arrest, false imprisonment, violations of his due process rights, and negligent hiring, training, and supervision of the defendant officers by the City of Florence, South Carolina. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC.

The defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on May 23, 2008. (Doc. #45). A response to the defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment was due on June 30, 2008. The plaintiff did not file a response to the defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #54). On October 19, 2008 the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that “this case be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b), Fed. R. Civ. P.,” or in the

alternative that “Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment . . . be granted.” (Doc. #54). The plaintiff did not file objections to the report. Objections were due on October 27, 2008.

This 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 the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and this case is hereby **DISMISSED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). (Doc. #54).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

December 2, 2008
Florence, South Carolina