

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

Benjamin Davis Bryant, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 J. Reuben Long Detention Center, Phillippe E. )  
 Thompson, Wayne M. Owens, Joey Johnson, )  
 Christine Snyder, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

C/A No.: 6:16-cv-02905-TLW

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Benjamin Davis Bryant, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action on August 22, 2016, alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 1. Thereafter, Defendant J. Reuben Long Detention Center was dismissed, *see* ECF No. 66, and the remaining Defendants, Defendants Phillippe E. Thompson, Wayne M. Owens, Joey Johnson, and Christine Snyder, filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 40. Plaintiff responded opposing the summary judgment motion, ECF No. 60, and Defendants replied, ECF No. 62. This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on July 6, 2017, by United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, ECF No. 69, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. *Id.* The deadline to file objections was July 20, 2017. However, Plaintiff failed to file objections to the Report. This matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the

recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "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 & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report, the relevant filings, and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the Court accepts the detailed factual and legal analysis by the Magistrate Judge and notes that Petitioner has not filed objections. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS** the Report, ECF No. 69. For the reasons stated in the Report, Defendants' motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 40, is **GRANTED**, and this action is hereby **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/Terry L. Wooten*  
Chief United States District Judge

July 25, 2017  
Columbia, South Carolina