

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

Kevin Anthony Hickman,	)	Case No.: 5:20-cv-0678-JD
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	<b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b>
Warden, F.C.I. Edgefield,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Kaymani D. West (“Report and Recommendation”), made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina<sup>1</sup>. Petitioner filed this petition seeking a Writ of Habeas Corpus on February 10, 2020. (DE 1.) Thereafter, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction on March 30, 2021. (DE 14.)

The Petitioner filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court 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 thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein.

---

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which 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 with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion to Dismiss (DE 14) is granted, the petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is denied, and the petition is dismissed without prejudice. It is further **ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is denied because Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Joseph Dawson, III  
United States District Judge

February 23, 2021  
Greenville, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (60) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.