

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished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)