

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| Edward Harold Saunders, Jr., |) | C/A No. 8:11-156-JFA-BHH |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| Mary M. Mitchell, Warden, FCI Edgefield, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

The *pro se* petitioner, Edward Harold Saunders, is a federal prisoner who brings this action under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. He alleges that he has been unlawfully detained in the Special Housing Unit at FCI Edgefield upon being found guilty of prison disciplinary violation.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the petitioner is not entitled to relief and that the petition should be dismissed without prejudice. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on February 3, 2011. However, the petitioner has failed to file objections. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. 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. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (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 to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

the Magistrate Judge, 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)

As the Magistrate Judge correctly opines, the petitioner's allegations of due process violations at his disciplinary hearings did not result in the loss of any constitutionally protected liberty interest or the imposition of any atypical and significant hardship. *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 484 (1995).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law.

Accordingly, the petition is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 21, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina



Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge