

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Kevin Johnson v. Chadwick Dotson et al.

No. 2:25-12580-BHH, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina (February 19, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and denies without prejudice Plaintiff Kevin Johnson’s motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Because no objections were filed, the court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and found that Plaintiff had not made the clear showing required for preliminary injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bruce H. Hendricks
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-12580-BHH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. The motion was referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended denial. With no objections filed, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and adopted it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- injunctions
- equitable relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether Plaintiff made the requisite clear showing to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific objections are filed, the district court reviews the magistrate judge's recommendation for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction because he failed to make the requisite clear showing of the elements necessary for such relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.’” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff sought a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction against the defendants. The magistrate judge determined that Plaintiff had not made a clear showing of the elements required for either form of injunctive relief. No party filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Kevin Johnson filed a motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker issued a Report and Recommendation recommending denial because Plaintiff had not clearly shown the elements required for either form of relief. No objections were filed, and the district court found no clear error, adopted the Report, and denied the motion without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Dotson

PER CURIAM.

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

Kevin Johnson,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 2:25-12580-BHH v.)

) ORDER

Chadwick Dotson; Arnold David) Robinson; South Carolina Department) of Corrections; Joel Anderson; Willie) Davis; Jamie Fergeli; Ms. Hollis; Mr.) Greggs; Mr. Ocean; John Doe #1;) John Doe #2; John Doe #3; Curtis) Earley; D. Harduff; Brent Blakeley;) Joseph Perks; Essence Byrd; Andrea) Foster; A. Williams; Mr. Hawkins; Dr.) Baldwin; Nicole Lawson; A. Enloe; Ms.) Rodriguez; Mr. Sanders; Tamara) Conwell; Kimberly McKnight; and) Tammie Rucker,)) Defendants.) _____) This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order ("TRO") and preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 8.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review. On January 13, 2026, Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion, explaining that Plaintiff failed to make a clear showing of the elements required for the issuance of a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction. See *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). (ECF No. 15.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 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.'") (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. As the Magistrate Judge correctly determined, Plaintiff has not made the requisite clear showing of the elements necessary for the issuance of a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 15); and the Court denies without prejudice Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order

and preliminary injunction (ECF No.8). 2 IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Bruce H. Hendricks United States District Judge February 19, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 3

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-south-carolina-united-states-district-court-for-the/2026/kevin-johnson-v-chadwick-dotson-et-al-2dxuvihz>