

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

Branson Jamal Thompson,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 5:15-1568-TMC
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Joseph McFadden,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

Branson Jamal Thompson (“Petitioner”), a state prisoner, filed this pro se Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civ. Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.). (ECF No. 48). The magistrate judge recommends that Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 28) be granted, and Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 44) be denied. *Id.* Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “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.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 28) is **GRANTED**, and Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 44) is **DENIED**. Petitioner's Petition is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In the instant matter, the court finds that Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." Accordingly, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

April 29, 2016  
Anderson, South Carolina