

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

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Burl Washington, |) Civil Action No. 5:16-3913-BHH |
| |) |
| Plaintiff, |) |
| |) |
| vs. |) |
| |) |
| United States; |) |
| Mrs. Cruz; |) |
| Loranth; |) |
| Massa; |) |
| Meeks; |) |
| Lepaine; |) |
| Garcia; |) |
| John Doe #2; |) |
| Jude Onucha; |) |
| K Bennett-Baker; |) |
| P. Robinson; |) |
| John Doe #3; |) |
| John Doe #4; |) |
| John Doe #5; |) |
| Paul Laird; |) |
| Paul Harvey; |) |
| B. Auterson; |) |
| James Cross; |) |
| Mr. Baugh; |) |
| Douglas Kruse; |) |
| Harold Gillian; |) |
| Mrs. Robinson; |) |
| Mrs. W. Lirios; |) |
| Mrs. Lyons; |) |
| David Goldsborough; |) |
| Steven Hoffimerr; |) |
| Frank Fester; |) |
| Margaret Hodges; |) |
| John Doe #1, |) |
| |) |
| Defendants. |) |
| |) |

ORDER AND OPINION

Plaintiff Burl Washington (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, brought this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1983. (ECF. No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina, this matter was referred to United

States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pretrial handling. The matter is now before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) issued by the Magistrate Judge on February 9, 2017. (ECF No. 22.) In her Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court partially dismiss the Complaint in this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process for Defendants Jude Onucha; K. Bennett-Baker; P. Robinson; John Does ##1, 2, 3, 4, 5; Paul Laird; Paul Harvey; B. Auterson; James Cross; Mr. Baugh; Douglas Kruse; Harold Gillian; Mrs. Robinson; Mrs. W. Lirios; Mrs. Lyons; David Goldsborough; Steven Hoffimerr; Frank Fester; and Margaret Hodges. Objections to the Report were due by February 27, 2017. No Objections were filed by any party.

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). 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).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court ACCEPTS and

incorporates the Report, (ECF No. 22), by reference into this Order. It is therefore ORDERED that the complaint in this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as to Defendants Jude Onucha; K. Bennett-Baker; P. Robinson; John Does ##1, 2, 3, 4, 5; Paul Laird; Paul Harvey; B. Auterson; James Cross; Mr. Baugh; Douglas Kruse; Harold Gillian; Mrs. Robinson; Mrs. W. Lirios; Mrs. Lyons; David Goldsborough; Steven Hoffimerr; Frank Fester; and Margaret Hodges, and that the matter be returned to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

March 2, 2017
Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.