

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

John Julius Smith, #246646,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
Warden, Goodman Correctional)
Institution,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

C/A No.: 4:16-cv-04008-TLW

ORDER

Petitioner John Julius Smith, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 on December 27, 2016. ECF No. 24. The Respondent filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on April 20, 2017. ECF No. 34. In response, the Petitioner filed a Motion for “Partial Summary Judgment and Motion for Expansion of the Records & Evidentiary Hearing” on May 4, 2017. ECF No. 38. This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on October 12, 2017, by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends granting the Respondent’s motion for summary judgement and denying Petitioner’s motions. ECF No. 41. Petitioner filed Objections to the Report on October 25, 2017. ECF No. 44. This matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept,

reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C.

§ 636. In conducting its review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections.... The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report, the Objections, and relevant filings. After careful consideration, the Court concludes that the Petitioner's objections are repetitive and offer no showing, either factually or legally that the Respondent's motion should be denied. Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Report, ECF No. 41, is **ACCEPTED**, and the Objections to the Report, ECF No. 44, are **OVERRULED**. For the reasons stated in the Report and those stated herein, Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**, and the Petition, ECF No. 24, is hereby **DISMISSED**. Petitioner's Motion for "Partial Summary Judgment and Motion for Expansion of the Records & Evidentiary Hearing", ECF No. 38, is **DENIED**.

The Court has reviewed this petition in accordance with Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings. The Court concludes that it is not appropriate to issue a certificate of

appealability as to the issues raised herein. Petitioner is advised that he may seek a certificate from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals under Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten _____
Chief United States District Judge

December 4, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina