

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

Quintin M. Littlejohn,)	Civil Action No.: 7:14-812-BHH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER AND OPINION
vs.)	
)	
Barack Obama, President of the)	
United States; Novant Health Care;)	
Social Security Administration,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The plaintiff Quintin M. Littlejohn (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, initiated this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the defendants Barack Obama, President of the United States, Novant Health Care and the Social Security Administration (“the defendants”) alleging violations of his constitutional rights because his insurance was cancelled in 2013. (ECF No. 1) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., the within action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pretrial handling and a Report and Recommendation. Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends that the court dismiss this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 14). The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter and the court incorporates them without recitation.

BACKGROUND

The plaintiff filed this action against the defendants alleging that his insurance was cancelled in 2013. On March 18, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this case be dismissed without prejudice and without

issuance and service of process because the federal defendants are immune from suit, and there is no basis for diversity jurisdiction in this case. (ECF No. 14.) On March 31, 2014, the plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 16.) Subsequent to the filing of the Report and Recommendation, the plaintiff filed a motion to vacate the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 22), a motion for summary judgment and motion to dismiss (ECF No. 23), and a motion for default judgment (ECF No. 27).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir.1982). In the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir.2005).

DISCUSSION

The plaintiff objects to the dismissal of his case. After a careful review of the

plaintiff's objections, it is fair to say that the plaintiff does not make any specific objections to the Report and Recommendation. Rather, the plaintiff's response to the Report and Recommendation merely rehashes the same allegations raised in his complaint or raises arguments that are incoherent.

Out of an abundance of caution, the Court has carefully reviewed the plaintiff's objections and has made a *de novo* review of the entire Report and Recommendation and finds that the Magistrate Judge fairly and accurately summarized the facts and applied the correct principles of law. Upon review, the Court finds the plaintiff's objections have no merit and are hereby overruled.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above and by the Magistrate Judge, the court overrules the plaintiff's objections and adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. All other pending motions are denied as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

March 18, 2015
Greenville, South Carolina