

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

Jerome Long,)	
)	C/A No. 6:12-1974-TMC
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Dr. Tomarchio, Medical Director,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Plaintiff, Jerome Long (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., all pre-trial proceedings were referred to a Magistrate Judge. On February 13, 2013, Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by the Defendant (Dkt. No. 34) be granted and that the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by the Plaintiff (Dkt. No. 22) be denied. The Magistrate Judge provided Plaintiff a notice advising him of his right to file objections to the Report. (Dkt. No. 40 at 8). Plaintiff filed objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report on March 6, 2013. (Dkt. No. 42).

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *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 to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The court is obligated to conduct a de novo review of every portion of the

Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been filed. *Id.* However, the court need not conduct a de novo review when a party makes only "general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge's conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Motion for Summary filed by the Defendant as set forth above be granted and that the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied. As noted above, Plaintiff filed objections to the Report which the Court has carefully reviewed. However, the Plaintiff's objections provide no basis for this court to deviate from the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition. The objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report or merely restate Plaintiff's claims.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record, the court adopts the Report (Dkt. No. 40) and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by the Defendant (Dkt. No. 34) is **GRANTED** and that the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 22) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

March 15, 2013
Anderson, South Carolina

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.