

detectives at HCDP before Marcus and other detectives. Nevertheless, the U.S. Marshals came to his job to arrest him. Plaintiff claims he was arrested abusively, even after checking in with them regularly at their requests. (Id.) Plaintiff says his shoulder was dislocated because of the rough handling, and the officers denied his request for medical attention at booking. (DE 18, p. 7.)

On March 31, 2023, Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. (DE 57.) Under Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the Court advised Plaintiff of the summary judgment and dismissal procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately to the motion. (DE 58.) After not receiving a response, the Court issued an order advising Plaintiff to file a response to this Motion. (DE 66.) After that, Plaintiff filed a document styled as a letter on June 28, 2023. (DE 76.) The Court construes this filing as Plaintiff's response since Plaintiff has not otherwise filed any other response to Defendant's motion.

The Report was issued on August 29, 2023, recommending the Court grant Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. (DE 81.) Plaintiff has not objected to the Report.³ In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court 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).

Accordingly, after a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record, the Court finds no clear error on the face of the record. Therefore, the Court adopts the Report (DE 81) and incorporates it here.

³ On or about September 7, 2023, Land contacted the Clerk of Court's office and indicated he would be filing a motion for an extension to object to the Report. No motion has been filed.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (DE 57) is granted as to all claims alleged in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint; however, the Court denies the request to consider this action as a strike under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joseph Dawson, III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Joseph Dawson, III
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
October 27, 2023

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.