

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

Arthur Foster, # 270123,	)	C/A NO. 6:10-748-CMC-WMC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
v.	)	
	)	
State Attorney General Henry McMaster;	)	
Jon Ozmit [sic], Attorney General, South	)	
Carolina Attorney General Office; Brad	)	
Cranshaw, Attorney General, South	)	
Carolina Attorney General Office;	)	
Richland Police Department; Richland	)	
County Police Chief; Leon Lott, Sheriff	)	
Richland County Sheriff Department; Larry	)	
Smith, Solicitor, Richland County Solicitor	)	
Office; Columbia Police Department;	)	
Charles Austin, Police Chief, Columbia	)	
City Police Department; South Carolina	)	
Law Enforcement Division, SLED,	)	
Connected Unknown Agents; Spartanburg	)	
County Police Department; Spartanburg	)	
County Police Chief, Spartanburg County	)	
Police Department; Chuck Wright, Sheriff,	)	
Spartanburg County Sheriff Department;	)	
Trey Gowdy, Solicitor, Spartanburg County	)	
Solicitor Office; Richard Warden,	)	
Attorney at Law; Mike Curley, Bonding	)	
Agent,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe for pre-trial proceedings

and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On April 14, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

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). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection.

*See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order. This action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie

CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina

May 6, 2010

C:\Documents and Settings\Mlb87\Local Settings\Temp\notes6030C8\10-748 Foster v. McMaster adopt rr dism wo prej wo svc.wpd