

Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it 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).

No party has filed objections to the R & R. In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct 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'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having thoroughly reviewed the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error, and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 47] of the Magistrate Judge. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendants' motions to dismiss [ECF Nos. 16 & 41] are **GRANTED** and, to the extent Plaintiff's response [ECF No. 25] could be construed as a motion to transfer venue to Maryland or North Carolina, that motion is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
August 10, 2015

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge