

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

The State of South Carolina,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 6:11-3365-HMH-JDA
	)	
vs.	)	<b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b>
	)	
Stephen John Guidetti,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin, 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> Proceeding pro se, Defendant Stephen John Guidetti (“Guidetti”), filed a notice of removal in this court on December 12, 2011, purporting to remove a case involving numerous traffic violations brought against him in the Chick Springs Summary Court. Magistrate Judge Austin determined that this court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned case, and therefore, she recommends summarily remanding the case to state court. Guidetti filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on January 5, 2012.

---

<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 (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).

Upon review, the court finds that Guidetti's objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report, and merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Austin's Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that this action is summarily remanded to state court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(c)(4), based upon lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
January 10, 2012

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.