

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

Jack T. Chastain, Jr., # 21173-045,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 5:10-cv-2453-TLW-JRM
)	
South Carolina Hi-way Patrol and)	
Cpl. Ligdon,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

The plaintiff, Jack T. Chastain, Jr. (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, pro se, on September 20, 2010. (Doc. # 1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 35). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 20), deny the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 32), and dismiss sua sponte any negligence claim the plaintiff may be asserting under South Carolina law. (Doc. # 35). The plaintiff filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 37). In conducting this 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 and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. # 35). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 20) is **GRANTED**, the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. # 32) is **DENIED**, and any claim for negligence the plaintiff may be asserting is **DISMISSED**. The plaintiff's request to stop filing fee (Doc. # 38) is also **DENIED**. See Dec. 10, 2010 Order (Doc. # 11); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and (b). In light of these rulings, this case is **DISMISSED** in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

March 7, 2012
Florence, South Carolina