

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

Perry Drake Gilmore,	)	C/A NO. 5:10-2663-CMC-KDW
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
v.	)	
	)	
Ronaldo D. Myers; Curtis Bufford,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On February 2, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff’s motion to amend the complaint be denied, Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and the complaint be dismissed with prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *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.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusion of the Report. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order except as noted below.

Defendants’ motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this matter is dismissed **without** prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *See Bryant v. Rich*, 530 F.3d 1368, 1375 n.11 (11th Cir. 2008) (noting that district court’s dismissal without prejudice on summary judgment motion proper where “neither party has evidenced that administrative remedies at [the correctional facility] are absolutely time barred or otherwise clearly infeasible.”).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
February 23, 2012