

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Dennis Temple, #274802,	)	C/A No. 8:13-3426-JFA-JDA
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Warden Joseph McFadden; Associate Warden	)	
Fred Thompson; Associate Warden James	)	
Blackwell; Chaplain James Cuttino; Muslim	)	
Chaplin Tami Abdul Mutakabbir, in their	)	
individual and official capacities,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Dennis Temple, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) raising various allegations that his constitutional and statutory rights have been violated in relation to his religious worship services.

The Magistrate Judge<sup>1</sup> has prepared a Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that defendants’ motion for summary judgment should be granted. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 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. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of 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).

Before the Magistrate Judge, an order was issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff did not respond, but instead filed a motion to dismiss the action.

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the court find the Report proper and adopts and incorporates the Report herein by reference.

Accordingly, the defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 58) is granted; and plaintiff's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 74) is granted as well.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.  
United States District Judge

September 30, 2014  
Columbia, South Carolina