



determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) 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 with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, 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 the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge's conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The Magistrate Judge has recommended that the plaintiff’s motion to remand (ECF No. 11) be granted. None of the defendants have filed objections to the Report and Recommendation, and the time for doing so expired on May 4, 2015.

### **CONCLUSION**

Having conducted a *de novo* review of the Report and the record, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge and adopts and incorporates by specific reference the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

IT IS ORDERED, therefore, that the plaintiff’s motion to remand (ECF No. 11) is GRANTED and this action is remanded to the Court of Common Pleas, Horry County, South Carolina, for disposition. The Clerk of this Court is directed

to forward the file along with a certified copy of this order to the Clerk of Court for Horry County.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

May 8, 2015  
Greenville, South Carolina