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

William Howard Rutland, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

Sgt. Rosemary Sanders and Ms. K. Shuler,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 8:09-1940-SB

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On February 1, 2010, United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the matter and recommending that the Court grant the Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of his right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within fourteen days of the date of service of the R&R. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) ("Within fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court."). To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written

objections, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of any portion of the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Entry 28) as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Entry 15) is granted, and the Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable Sol Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

February 25, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina