

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

Dale L. Ford,)	Civil Action No. 4:10-cv-1207-RMG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Mr. Tom Fox, Jail Director,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff brought this *pro se* action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was automatically referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for all pretrial proceedings pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) D.S.C. The Magistrate Judge recommended dismissing Plaintiff’s claims for failure to prosecute due to Plaintiff’s failure to file an opposition to Defendant’s motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 29). Plaintiff has failed to object to the R&R. As shown herein, this Court has reviewed the Record for any errors of law and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s report.

Discussion

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This

Court may also “receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions.” *Id.*

Here the Magistrate Judge instructed Plaintiff of the importance of filing a response to a summary judgment motion. (Dkt. No. 24). Nevertheless, Plaintiff failed to file any response. The *Roseboro* notification was return as undeliverable as was the R&R. (Dkt. Nos. 27 & 32). Plaintiff has failed to provide the Court with any other address and Plaintiff has not objected to the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute. (Dkt. No. 29). As a result, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the order of this Court and incorporates it herein.

Conclusion

Accordingly, the Complaint is **dismissed** for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Court Judge

December 22, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina