

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

Barrington Wayne Grant,)
#1059-2465-1018,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Barnwell County Detention Center,)
Cpt. Razar,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

Civil No. 4:17-cv-2120-BHH

ORDER

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action attempting to state a claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations. On August 25, 2017, Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers III issued a report and recommendation (“Report”) outlining Plaintiff’s claims and recommending that the Court dismiss this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Specifically, Magistrate Judge Rogers determined that Plaintiff’s complaint lacks a specific request for relief such that a ruling by this Court would amount to an advisory opinion. In addition, Magistrate Judge Rogers determined that Defendant Barnwell County Detention Center is not a “person” amenable to suit pursuant to § 1983.

Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The

recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident 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 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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s findings.

Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 9), and the Court dismisses this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

September 19, 2017
Charleston, South Carolina