

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Craig A. Caldwell,)	C.A. No. 9:09-158-TLW-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Dr. White and Nurse Carlene Ridgall,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee, brought this *pro se* civil action against the defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff’s complaints relate to the medical treatment he received while incarcerated at the Newberry County Detention Center.

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed June 22, 2009, by United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Marchant recommends that the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and that this case be dismissed. The Plaintiff has not objected to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation 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).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 27), and this action is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

August 11, 2009
Florence, South Carolina