

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

Yashawnus Patterson,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 9:18-cv-1514-TMC
v.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Levern Cohen, Deangelo Ford,	)	
and Tatiana Woods,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Defendants Levern Cohen, Deangelo Ford, and Tatiana Woods filed a motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 96). Plaintiff subsequently filed a response in opposition to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 113). Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismiss the case. (ECF No. 119). The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report. *Id.* at 20. Defendants filed objections to the Report. (ECF No. 121). However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The recommendations set forth in the Report have no presumptive weight, and this court remains responsible for making a final determination in this matter. *See Matthews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which a specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter

with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the court need only review for clear error “those portions which are not objected to—including those portions to which only ‘general and conclusory’ objections have been made[.]” *Dunlap v. TM Trucking of the Carolinas, LLC*, 288 F. Supp. 3d 654, 662 (D.S.C. 2017). “An objection is specific if it ‘enables the district judge to focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.’” *Id.* at 662 n.6 (quoting *United States v. One Parcel of Real Prop., With Bldgs., Appurtenances, Improvements, & Contents, Known As: 2121 E. 30th St., Tulsa, Okla.*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1059 (10th Cir. 1996)).

Defendants object to the magistrate judge’s Report to the extent that it did not address other grounds listed in Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 121). Because the court finds that the issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation are dispositive of the case as a whole and that Defendants are entitled to summary judgment based on those issues, the court declines to address the other issues set forth in Defendants’ objections. The court need not address every conceivable reason why Defendant is entitled to judgment when the reasons addressed are dispositive of the case as a whole.

After a careful and thorough review of the record under the appropriate standards, as set forth above, the court adopts the magistrate judge’s Report (ECF No. 119), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 96).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
December 11, 2019

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.