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

Rev. Franklin C. Reaves, Ph.D., *et al.*,	C.A. No. 4:07-3559-TLW-TER
Plaintiffs,	
vs.	ORDER
City of Mullins, *et al.*,	
Defendants.	

The Plaintiffs, proceeding *pro se*, bring this action asserting both federal and state causes of action. Plaintiffs' claims relate to the alleged condemnation of property located in Mullins, South Carolina.

On September 19, 2008, the Defendants moved for summary judgment. On July 27, 2009, United States Magistrate Judge Tom Rogers, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), filed a Report and Recommendation ("the Report"). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the Defendants motions for summary judgment be granted, that the Plaintiffs' federal claims be dismissed, and that the court decline to exercise jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims. On August 13, 2009, Plaintiffs filed objections to the Magistrate's Report.

This Court is charged with reviewing the Magistrate's Report and the Plaintiff's objections thereto. In conducting this 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 this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 136); Defendants' motions for summary judgment are granted (Docs. # 99, 100), and this case is dismissed. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3), and as explained in the Report, the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' remaining state law claims. All remaining motions pending in this case are deemed moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

August 21, 2009
Florence, South Carolina