Holland v. Antonelli Doc. 19

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

Michael D. Holland, #54089-177,	) C/A No.	. 5:18-2951-BHH-KDW
Petitione	ORE	DER AND OPINION
VS.	)	
Warden Bryon M. Antonelli,	)	
Responder	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. On November 30, 2018, Magistrate Judge West issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, be dismissed without prejudice. (ECF No. 14.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. Id. The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made.

Petitioner filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on December 17, 2018. In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, "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.

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations for clear error. Finding none, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is subject to summary dismissal.

2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and advisory committee's note).

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 14) is adopted and incorporated herein by reference, and this action is DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks</u> United States District Judge

January 3, 2019 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.