

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

Wyatt Earp Harper,	)	Civil Action No.: 9:16-cv-00404-RBH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
NFN Cawthan, <i>Business Office</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff Wyatt Earp Harper, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R & R) of United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). See R & R [ECF No. 71]. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment and dismiss this case. R & R at 10.

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 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 R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s objections were due by October 23, 2017. See ECF Nos. 71 & 72.

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 adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 71] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 62] and **DISMISSES** this case *with prejudice*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
November 8, 2017

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