

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

James P. Moody,)	C/A NO. 9:09-1480-CMC-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-versus-)	OPINION and ORDER
)	
Willie Eagleton, Warden; Dr. Michael)	
Beinor; Kimberly C. Gastin, LPN; Amy)	
Smith; and Adrienn L. Fuller, in their)	
individual capacities and in their official)	
capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint alleging violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On March 18, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and this matter dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on April 5, 2010.

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. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident 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 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.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff’s objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order.

Plaintiff’s objections are, for the most part, merely repetitive of the arguments which were assessed and rejected by the Magistrate Judge, offering no persuasive legal authority to indicate the Magistrate Judge erred in his analysis of Plaintiff’s complaint. Conclusory accusations without more do not offer an escape from summary judgment.

Defendants’ motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this matter is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
April 13, 2010

C:\Documents and Settings\Guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesFFF692\09-1480 Moody v. Eagleton adopt rr gr sumjgm.wpd