

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, GREENVILLE DIVISION

Matthew Baumgartner v. The Corporate Associate, Inc.; Langford
Electric, Inc.

Baumgartner · No. 6:25-cv-07909-JDA-PJG · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviews a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation recommending denial of Langford Electric, Inc.’s motion to dismiss. Finding no clear error and no objections from the parties, the court adopts the recommendation and denies the motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-07909-JDA-PJG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an employment-related complaint against The Corporate Associate, Inc. and Langford Electric, Inc. Langford Electric moved to dismiss. After the magistrate judge recommended denial of the motion, neither party objected, and the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and adopted it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of a specific objection to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error on the face of the record rather than conducting de novo review. Specific objections require de novo review of the challenged portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny Langford Electric's motion to dismiss contained clear error.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need not conduct de novo review and instead must satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The Report and Recommendation contained no clear error, so the court accepted and incorporated it by reference and denied Langford Electric's motion to dismiss.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection.”

“Accordingly, Langford Electric’s motion to dismiss is DENIED.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Baumgartner filed a complaint against The Corporate Associate, Inc. and Langford Electric, Inc. Langford Electric moved to dismiss the complaint. The magistrate judge recommended that the motion be denied, and the parties filed no objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Matthew Baumgartner filed his Complaint on July 19, 2025. Langford Electric filed a motion to dismiss on September 26, 2025. Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett issued a Report and Recommendation on March 24, 2026, recommending denial of the motion. Because no objections were filed, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, accepted it, incorporated it by reference, and denied Langford Electric's motion to dismiss.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)

- *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Baumgartner

PER CURIAM.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

GREENVILLE DIVISION

Matthew Baumgartner,) Case No. 6:25-cv-07909-JDA-PJG) Plaintiff,))

v.) OPINION AND ORDER

) The Corporate Associate, Inc.;) Langford Electric, Inc.,)) Defendants.) This matter is before the Court on Defendant Langford Electric, Inc. (“Langford Electric”)’s motion to dismiss. [Doc. 23.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings. Plaintiff filed his Complaint on July 19, 2025. [Doc. 1.] On September 26, 2025, Langford Electric filed a motion to dismiss. [Doc. 11; see also Doc. 18.] On March 24, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that Langford Electric’s motion to dismiss be denied. [Doc. 23.] The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. [Id. at 4.] The parties did not file objections to the Report, and the time to do so has lapsed. 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 the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71

(1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 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” (internal quotation marks omitted)). The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, Langford Electric’s motion to dismiss is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge April 13, 2026 Greenville, South Carolina
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.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-south-carol/2026/matthew-baumgartner-v-the-corporate-associate-inc-langford-0x4c6a0w>