

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

Verdell Williams, # 264383,)	C/A NO. 8:08-1883-CMC-BHH
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
Robert Stevenson, Warden of Broad River)	
Correctional Institution,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Petitioner’s *pro se* application for writ of habeas corpus, filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On February 17, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Respondent’s motion for summary judgment be granted and this matter dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Despite this court giving Petitioner a *sua sponte* extension of time to file objections to the Report, Petitioner has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is

made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. The court notes that the Report states that Petitioner was “found guilty as charged” on all charges. Report at 2 (Dkt. # 21, filed Feb. 17, 2009).¹ However, Petitioner was convicted of first degree burglary, attempted strong arm robbery, and the lesser-included offense of assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature.

Therefore, Respondent’s motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this Petition is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
March 25, 2009

¹Petitioner was charged with burglary in the first degree, attempted strong arm robbery, and attempted criminal sexual conduct in the first degree.