

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

Tony L. Moore,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 5:20-cv-4229-TMC
	)	
Tishiro P. Inabinet, Weston Mosley,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Bernard Moore, Robert Brannon,	)	
Raymond Gathers, C. Carter, and	)	
Bryan P. Stirling,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Tony L. Moore, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF Nos. 1; 2; 11). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for all pretrial proceedings. On August 9, 2021, Defendants filed a joint motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 68). On September 24, 2021, Plaintiff filed both a response in opposition to Defendants' motion (ECF No. 76) and his own motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 77). Defendants subsequently filed a response in opposition to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, (ECF No. 82), and a reply in support of their own motion (ECF No. 83).

Now before the court is the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report"), recommending that the court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment, deny Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, and dismiss this action. (ECF No. 84). The Report was mailed to Plaintiff at the address he provided the court, (ECF No. 85), and has not been returned as undeliverable. Therefore, Plaintiff is presumed to have received the Report. Plaintiff was advised

of his right to file specific objections to the Report, (ECF No. 84-1), but failed to do so. The time for Plaintiff to object to the Report has now expired, and this matter is ripe for review.

The magistrate judge’s recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. *Wimmer v. Cook*, 774 F.2d 68, 72 (4th Cir. 1985) (quoting *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)). Nevertheless, “[t]he district court is only required to review *de novo* those portions of the report to which specific objections have been made, and need not conduct *de novo* review ‘when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.’” *Farmer v. McBride*, 177 Fed. App’x 327, 330–31 (4th Cir. April 26, 2006) (quoting *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)). 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). However, in the absence of specific objections to the Report, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Greenspan v. Brothers Prop. Corp.*, 103 F. Supp. 3d 734, 737 (D.S.C. 2015) (citing *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983)).

Thus, having reviewed the Report and the record and, finding no clear error, the court agrees with, and wholly **ADOPTS**, the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in the Report (ECF No. 84), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 68) and **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 77).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
November 19, 2021

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.