

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

James Loftin,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C/A No.: 6:12-cv-00863-GRA
)	
v.)	
)	
South Carolina Department of Public)	
Safety; Trooper T.J. Genco)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

This matter comes before the Court for review of the magistrate’s Report and Recommendation filed on May 24, 2012 and made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), D.S.C. Plaintiff James Loftin brought a motion to dismiss and summary judgment on April 2, 2012. ECF No. 15. In her May 24, 2012 Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin recommended that Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss and for summary judgment to be denied. ECF No. 30. Plaintiff did not file objections. For the reasons stated herein, the Court adopts the magistrate’s Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro*

se litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982). A court may not construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir. 1993), nor is a district court required to recognize "obscure or extravagant claims defying the most concerted efforts to unravel them," *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985), *cert denied*, 475 U.S. 1088 (1986).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th Cir. 1983). Plaintiff has filed no objections.

After a review of the record, this Court finds that the magistrate's Report and Recommendation accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to dismiss and summary judgment is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Ross Anderson, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

July 6, 2012
Anderson, South Carolina