

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Lawrence L. Crawford,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Officer Ms. Atkinson, et al.,

DEFENDANTS

Case No. 9:21-cv-02526-TLW

**Order**

Plaintiff Lawrence L. Crawford, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action making a host of allegations in a 503-page Amended Complaint, naming countless defendants, including “The United States Congress,” “The (193) Member States of the United Nations,” “All Sugar Companies,” “All Federal Employees,” “The N.F.L.,” and even “The Two Mailroom Ladies at Lee C.I.” ECF No. 59 at 5–11. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 46.

In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that the Amended Complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. After the magistrate judge filed the Report, Plaintiff filed a host of variously titled documents. ECF Nos. 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the Report, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified

findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and the objections, for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED**.<sup>1</sup> This case is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*  
Terry L. Wooten  
Senior United States District Judge

August 2, 2022  
Columbia, South Carolina

---

<sup>1</sup> The caption of one of his filings includes a "motion for an extension of time to file objections to the report and recommendation once the magistrate rule on the motion to transfer jurisdiction to the trustee and motion to motion therefor." ECF No. 49 at 1. To the extent that filing includes a request for additional time to file objections, the Court concludes that he has not set forth a legally sufficient basis to warrant additional time and his request is therefore denied.