

On August 11, 2016, Magistrate Judge McDonald issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court deny the motion to certify class and the motions for reconsideration. (ECF No. 50.)

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 may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made. On August 11, 2016, Plaintiff and the 14 terminated Plaintiffs were advised of their right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 50 at 5). However, neither Plaintiff nor the 14 terminated Plaintiffs have filed any objections, and the time to do so expired on August 29, 2016. 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).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to be proper. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is approved and incorporated herein by reference. The motion to certify class (ECF No. 41) and the motions for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45) are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

September 20, 2016
Greenville, South Carolina