

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

Richard D. Salters, II,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:13-1182-MGL
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
	)	
Lt. Joseph Cooper;	)	
Lake City Police Department;	)	
Orangeburg Sheriff's Department,	)	
Todd Tucker, and	)	
Karen Parott,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

On May 20, 2013, Plaintiff Richard D. Salters, II, (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed the operative Amended Complaint in this action alleging constitutional violations construed as pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 10 and No. 12). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and District of South Carolina Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for review pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and § 1915A. On November 17, 2014, the Magistrate Judge prepared a Report and Recommendation, (“the Report”), recommending that Defendants Lake City Police Department, Orangeburg Sheriff’s Department, Todd Tucker, and Karen Parott be dismissed from this case. (ECF No. 38). Objections to the Report were due by December 4, 2014. Plaintiff did not file any Objections to the Report. The matter is now ripe for review by this Court.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the

Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Applying the above standards to the instant matter, the Court has carefully reviewed the record, applicable law, and the Magistrate Judge’s Report, (ECF No. 38), and finding no clear error in the Report, the Court adopts and incorporates it herein by reference. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint is hereby summarily **DISMISSED** as to Defendants Lake City Police Department, Orangeburg Sheriff’s Department, Todd Tucker, and Karen Parott.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

May 12, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina