

Ruth Elizabeth Hodges,)
)
 Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 7:13-cv-01799-JMC
)
 v.) **ORDER**
)
 Sloan Construction,)
)
 Defendant.)
)

Dockets.Justia.com

provide an explanation for adopting the 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). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

Therefore, after a thorough and careful review of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court finds the magistrate judge's Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law and the record in this case. The court **ACCEPTS** the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 34]. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for a More Definite Statement [ECF No. 21] is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. Specifically, the Motion to Dismiss is **DENIED**, and the Alternative Motion for a More Definite Statement is **GRANTED**. Since Plaintiff has failed to timely file any objections to the Report and also has not amended her complaint to include more specific allegations regarding her claim, this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



United States District Judge

December 31, 2013
Greenville, South Carolina