

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

Amelia Salters, f/k/a Amelia Woods,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:14-2435-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
	)	
Condolux Inc., Condolux Properties,	)	
LLC, and Condolux Sales &	)	
Development, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

On June 18, 2014, Plaintiff filed this action against Defendants, alleging that Defendants harassed and discriminated against her because of her race and retaliated against her for engaging in protected activity, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e, *et seq.* (“Title VII”). She also pled claims for breach of contract, breach of contract with fraudulent intent, and violation of the South Carolina Payment of Wages Act (SCPWA), S.C. Code Ann. § 41-10-10, *et seq.*

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 D.S.C., this employment discrimination matter was referred to United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, for consideration of pretrial matters. The magistrate judge prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation which recommends that Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 50) be denied as to Plaintiff’s hostile work environment claim and retaliation claim, and granted as to all other claims. (ECF No. 72.) Neither party filed objections, and the time for doing so expired on June 6, 2016. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter,

and the Court incorporates them without recitation.

The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report and Recommendation 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. 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).

After reviewing the motion, the record, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is ORDERED that Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 50) is denied as to Plaintiff’s hostile work environment claim and retaliation claim, and granted as to all other claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
June 16, 2016