

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SPARTANBURG DIVISION**

Carolyn E. Reed-Smith,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 Spartanburg County School District Seven,)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

ORDER

Civil Action No.: 7:11-cv-00970-JMC

This matter is before the court for a review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation in which the Magistrate Judge recommended that the court grant summary judgment to Defendant on Plaintiff’s claims for retaliation and race and sex discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and violations of other state and federal statutes. After a thorough review of the record in this matter, the applicable law, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, and the objections filed by Plaintiff, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is 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 and Recommendation 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). The Report and Recommendation

sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation herein without a recitation.

Plaintiff timely filed objections [Doc. 65] to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Although Plaintiff filed several objections, the court finds that Plaintiff's objections are not specific but merely restatements of the arguments made in her initial filings, only set forth negative assertions to Defendant's arguments, and do not alert the court to any matters that were erroneously considered by the Magistrate Judge. Moreover, Plaintiff fails to direct the court to any evidence in the record to support her contentions that the Magistrate Judge erred in his decision to recommend the grant of summary judgment to Defendant. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. In the absence of specific objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Accordingly, after a thorough review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court accepts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. 62] and incorporates it herein. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 40] is **GRANTED**. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3), the court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any remaining state law claims. Additionally, as a result of the court's ruling herein, Defendant's Motion in Limine [Doc. 55] is moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
May 31, 2012