

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

Denon D. Carson, Jr.,)	
)	Civil Action No. 4:13-1988-TMC-TER
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Cecilia Reynolds,)	
Jerry Washington, and)	
Philips Riggins,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Defendant Jerry Washington (ECF No. 35) be granted. (ECF No. 51). Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report (ECF No. 51-1), and he timely filed objections. (ECF No. 62).

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court need not conduct a de novo review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In that case, the court reviews the Report only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

As set forth above, Plaintiff timely filed objections to the Report. (ECF No. 62). However, his objections fail to address any specific, dispositive portion of the Report. The court has thoroughly reviewed the Report and Plaintiff's objections and finds no reason to deviate from the Report's recommended disposition. Moreover, the court notes that two of Plaintiff's objections address issues regarding his claims against Defendants Cecilia Reynolds and Philips Riggins, which were not addressed in this Report.¹

Based on the foregoing, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 51) and incorporates it herein. Accordingly, Defendant Washington's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 35) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

April 10, 2014
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

¹Defendants Reynolds and Riggins have filed a separate motion for summary judgment, which remains pending before the magistrate judge. (ECF No. 55).