

No parties have filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct 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'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 57] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** *with leave to refile* Plaintiff's first motion for preliminary injunction [ECF No. 21] and motion to amend the first motion for preliminary injunction [ECF No. 27]. The Court **FINDS AS MOOT** Plaintiff's second motion for preliminary injunction [ECF No. 54].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
September 11, 2017

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff's objections were due by August 28, 2017. *See* ECF Nos. 57 & 58.