

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, FLORENCE DIVISION**

**Henry Woods v. Capt. Williams, Lieutenant Isaac/Issac, and Nurse
Lapoint**

Woods · No. 4:25-3964-MGL-TER · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and dismisses Defendant Issac/Isaac without prejudice. The action continues against the other defendants who have answered, and the plaintiff is notified of his right to appeal within thirty days.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION HENRY WOODS, § Plaintiff, § § VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:25-3964-MGL-TER § CAPT. WILLIAMS, LIEUTENANT ISAAC/ § ISSAC, and NURSE LAPOINT, § Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DISMISSING A DEFENDANT FROM THE LAWSUIT Plaintiff Henry Woods (Woods) who is a self-represented state prisoner, filed this lawsuit against Defendants Capt.

Williams, Lieutenant Isaac/Issac, and Nurse Lapoint. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Issac/Issac be dismissed without prejudice and this action continue to proceed against the other Defendants who have answered.

The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight.

The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report 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.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on January 22, 2026, but Woods failed to file any objections. “[I]n 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.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc.*

Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore the judgment of the Court Issac/Issac is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, and this action will continue to proceed against the other Defendants who have answered. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed this 19th day of February, 2026, in Columbia, South Carolina. /s/ Mary Geiger Lewis MARY GEIGER LEWIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE ***** NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL Woods is hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.