UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James S. Strickland, #271958, Plaintiff, vs. Shelly Superor, of Comm. Dpt.; Dr. Moore, Nurse Shelly; Dr. Babb; Dr. Alewine; Lieber CI, Defendants.	)	C/A No. 4:12-278-JFA-TER ORDER

The *pro se* plaintiff, James S. Strickland, is an inmate at the Kirkland Reception and Evaluation Center of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. He brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983[1] repeating allegations and claims of improper medical care and unconstitutional conditions of confinement that have been raised, and adjudicated, in prior actions in this district.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action[2] has prepared a Report and Recommendation and opines that the complaint should be dismissed as it is barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

[1] The plaintiff has filed this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

[2] The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. 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).

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on June 7, 2012. However, the plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report within the time limits prescribed. In the absence of specific objections to the Report 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).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation proper and incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, this action is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge

June 27, 2012
Columbia, South Carolina