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

Taylor Alexander Duncan, Plaintiff, v. Southern Health Partners, Defendants.	)	Civil Action No. 8:16-cv-03370-JMC **ORDER**

Plaintiff Taylor Alexander Duncan brings this action against Defendants, Southern Health Partners and Head Nurse Jennifer ("Head Nurse"), a nurse who is employed at Anderson County Detention Center. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff seeks claims for "medical neglect, negligence and malpractice" against Southern Health Partners (ECF No. 1 at 2.) Plaintiff also claims that Southern Health Partners violated his due process rights. *Id.* at 5. On November 22, 2016, Plaintiff amended his complaint to dismiss the Head Nurse from this case. (ECF No. 15.)

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, filed on November 30, 2016, recommends that the court dismiss Plaintiff's action with prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 21.) The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423

U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 21 at 7.) However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, 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 and Recommendation 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).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. (ECF No. 21.) It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1), as amended (ECF No. 15), is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

United States District Judge

April 7, 2017
Columbia, South Carolina