



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

LARRY WILLIAMS,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	CIVIL ACTION 5:19-CV-0182-MGL-KDW
	§	
SCOTT B. LEWIS, SUSAN M. DUFFY,	§	
FELICIA OGUNSILE, ADAM T.	§	
BRADBURN, CAPT. LANE, UNIT	§	
COUNSELOR BUTLER, and WARDEN	§	
GLAND,	§	
Defendants.	§	

---



---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

---



---

Larry Williams (Williams) brought his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, coupled with his state court claim, against Defendants Scott B. Lewis, Susan M. Duffy, Felicia Ogunsile, Adam T. Bradburn, Captain Lane, Unit Counselor Butler, and Warden Gland (Defendants). Williams is self represented.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Plaintiff's motions for summary judgment be denied. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

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 the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on December 12, 2019, the Clerk of Court entered Williams's objections on December 20, 2019, and Defendants filed their reply on January 2, 2020. The Clerk also entered several letters and additional attachments from Williams around this time period. The Court has liberally construed those letters and additional attachments as supplemental objections. Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed all of Williams's objections, but holds them to be without merit. It will therefore enter judgment accordingly.

As the Magistrate Judge correctly noted, Williams "has not met the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) in that he [has] failed to provide both a factual and legal basis for his motions. [He] must offer more than a restatement of the complaint." Report at 2. Consequently, the Court will overrule Williams's objections and deny his motions for summary judgment.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court overrules Williams's objections, adopts the Report, and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Williams's motions for summary judgment are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 27th day of April, 2020, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis \_\_\_\_\_  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Williams is hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.