

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

EARNEST E. VAUGHN, SR., formerly )  
246912, also known as Earnest E. Vaughn, )  
also known as Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr., )  
also known as Earnest Edward Vaughn, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

Case No. 8:15-cv-01954-TLW

ANDERSON COUNTY; SHERIFF )  
SKIPPER; DEPUTY M. W. HUNICUTT; )  
and DEPUTY, all in both capacities, )

Defendants. )

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Earnest E. Vaughn, Sr., proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his constitutional rights by Anderson County, Anderson County Sheriff Skipper, and two Sheriff's Deputies. (Doc. #8). This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kevin McDonald, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court dismiss the case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. #15). Plaintiff's objections to the Report were due by June 22, 2015. Plaintiff failed to file objections, and this matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections

to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "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 & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report in accordance with this standard, and it concludes that the Magistrate Judge's legal and factual analyses are sufficient to warrant summary dismissal of this case. The Court again notes that Plaintiff has failed to file objections to the Report. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #15). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

June 29, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina