

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

Isaac Peter Chase,

Plaintiff,

v.

Greenville Technical College; Susan N. O'Brien; Patty Amick; Lucy Pulliam; and Keith L. Miller,

Defendants.

C/A No. 6:12-03376-TMC

ORDER

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action alleging discrimination by the Defendants. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge ("Report"), made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See *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 objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the magistrate judge's recommendation, or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (Dkt. No. 16 at 9). However, Plaintiff did not file any objections. In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "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.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, including the complaint and Plaintiff’s answers to the court’s special interrogatories, the court adopts the Report (Dkt. No. 16) and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is summarily **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina
January 8, 2013