



In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to 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 in the instant case and the record in this case. The court **ACCEPTS** the Report and Recommendation. [ECF No. 14]. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Complaint [ECF No. 1] is **DENIED** and this case is **DISMISSED** *without prejudice* and without service of process. It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's request for a stay of this case is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "J. Michelle Childs". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

United States District Judge

November 6, 2013  
Greenville, South Carolina