

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

**Darrell R. Cagle, Terry L. Cagle, and Karen M. Cagle v. City of
Greensboro et al.**

Cagle · No. 1:26-CV-103-DAB-JGM · Decided May 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge’s recommendation denying the plaintiffs’ motion for default judgment. Because no objections were filed, the court applied clear-error review and found no clear error in the recommendation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David A. Bragdon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
DECIDED	May 11, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-CV-103-DAB-JGM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation recommending denial of Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment. No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's recommendation, the district court must satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before adopting the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Darrell R. Cagle, Terry L. Cagle, Karen M. Cagle v. City of Greensboro, et al.

TOPICS

[default judgment](#) [default](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment when no party filed objections.

HOLDINGS

1. Because no objections were filed, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and, finding none, adopted the recommendation.
2. Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment was denied through adoption of the magistrate judge's recommendation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to adopt the recommendation.’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment against the defendants. A magistrate judge recommended denying the motion because of the Fourth Circuit's preference for resolving cases on their merits. No party objected to that recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 13, 2026, the magistrate judge recommended denying Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment based on the Fourth Circuit's preference for resolving cases on the merits. The objection deadline passed on April 30, 2026, without objections. The district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and adopted it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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