

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

Conrad L. Slocumb, *a/k/a Conrad Lamont Slocumb,*

Plaintiff,

v.

Dr. Beverly Wood, *M.D.*; Dr. Marcia Garcia, *P.A.*; Dr. NFN Parker, *M.D., Contract Physician*; Doctor NFN Prest, *M.D., Contract Physician*; Nurse NFN Mullins, *R.N., H.C.A.*; Nurse Roselyn Boatwright, *R.N.*; Nurse Roseanne Mack, *L.P.N.*; Ladford Fate, *H.S.C.*; Annie Rumler, *SCDC Staff Attorney*; Dr. NFN McRee, *M.D.*; Warden Tim Riley, *K.C.I.*; Wayne McCade, *Regional Director*; Michael McCall, *Deputy Director*, SCDC Director NFN Stirling; Sgt. NFN Watson, *KCI*; Sgt. NFN Gathers, *KCI*; A.W. NGN Thompson, *KCI*; Officer Spigner, *KCI Librarian*; Major Vaghn Jackson, *KCI*; NFN Marshal, *KCI Food Service Director*; John Doe, *Kirkland Maintenance Supervisor*; General Assembly; Dr. T. White, *KCI Dentist*; SIB Nurses; Nurse NFN Higgins, *Agency Nurse Director*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 9:17-1298-BHH

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff’s pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review. On September 13, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation (“Report”) outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss

Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. As the Magistrate Judge noted, Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses appear to be groups of people and such groups are not amenable to suit under § 1983. Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file written objections to the Report 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 Report 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 adopts and incorporates the Report (ECF No. 17) and dismisses Defendants General Assembly and SIB Nurses without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

October 11, 2017
Charleston, South Carolina