

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

Leonora Nelson; Jean Nelson Lumsby;)
and Selena Nelson Cecchini, as)
Rosalind Nelson's Natural Daughter)
and Heir at Law,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Levy Center, LLC,)

Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff,)

v.)

The Law Offices of Horace Jones, Esq.;)
Horace Jones; and The Wilcy R.)
Nelson Family, LLC,)

Third-Party Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 9:11-1184-SB-BHH

ORDER


This matter is before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation ("R&R"), which was filed on March 19, 2014, and which recommends that the Court deny the Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Attached the R&R was a notice advising the parties of their right to file written, specific objections to the R&R within fourteen days of receiving a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the R&R to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in

part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. 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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court hereby adopts the R&R (Entry 110) and denies the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Entry 53).

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Sol Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

April 9, 2014
Charleston, South Carolina

