

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

Steven Eddington v. South Carolina Department of Corrections, Lt.
James Williams, Lt. Gadsen, Captain Doe, A.W. Bailey, Warden
Cohen, A.W. Washington, Mrs. Shuler, Lt. Becker, Major Fennell, Lt.
Boles, Mrs. Allen, and Officer Mandigo

Eddington · No. 2:25-12571-MGL-MGB · Decided April 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismisses Steven Eddington’s claims against the South Carolina Department of Corrections with prejudice. The court notes that Eddington filed no objections and provides notice of his right to appeal within thirty days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Charleston Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mary Geiger Lewis
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Charleston Division
DECIDED	April 23, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-12571-MGL-MGB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal with prejudice of Eddington's claims against the South Carolina Department of Corrections. Eddington filed no objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Because no timely objections were filed, the district court reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error rather than conducting de novo review. Specific objections would have required de novo review of the challenged portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order adopting a Report and Recommendation, with no reporter citation identified.

PARTIES

Steven Eddington v. South Carolina Department of Corrections, Lt. James Williams, Lt. Gadsen, Captain Doe, A.W. Bailey, Warden Cohen, A.W. Washington, Mrs. Shuler, Lt. Becker, Major Fennell, Lt. Boles, Mrs. Allen, Officer Mandigo

TOPICS

section 1983 civil procedure standard of review appellate procedure sovereign immunity

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights litigation prisoner litigation federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the unobjected-to Report and Recommendation for clear error rather than de novo.
2. Whether the Report and Recommendation dismissing Eddington's claims against the South Carolina Department of Corrections with prejudice should be adopted.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party fails to file timely objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and dismissed with prejudice Eddington's claims against the South Carolina Department of Corrections.
3. A party's failure to file timely objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation waives appellate review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[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.’” (unpaginated)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Steven Eddington, a state prisoner, filed a pro se civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the South Carolina Department of Corrections and multiple prison personnel. The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the claims against the Department with prejudice and separately authorized service on the individual defendants. Eddington did not object to the Report and Recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Eddington, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the South Carolina Department of Corrections and various individual prison personnel. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation on March 19, 2026, recommending dismissal with prejudice as to the Department, while separately authorizing summonses for the individual defendants. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the claims against the Department with prejudice; the claims against the individual defendants were not dismissed by this order.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985)

OPINION

Eddington

PER CURIAM.

Ss ny Cori”

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CHARLESTON DIVISION

STEVEN EDDINGTON, §

§ Plaintiff, § § vs. § Civil Action No. 2:25-12571-MGL-MGB §

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF §

CORRECTIONS, LT. JAMES WILLIAMS, §

LT. GADSEN, CAPTAIN DOE, A.W. §

BAILEY, WARDEN COHEN, A.W. §

WASHINGTON, MRS. SHULER, LT. §

BECKER, MAJOR FENNELL, LT. BOLES, §

MRS. ALLEN, and OFFICER MANDIGO, §

§ Defendants. §

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT IN PART

Plaintiff Steven Eddington, a state prisoner, filed this lawsuit pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against various prison personnel (the “individual defendants”) and the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC). This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (the Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court

Eddington's complaint be dismissed with prejudice as to SCDC. 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 separately authorized summons of the individual defendants. 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 March 19, 2026. To date, Eddington has 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 under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. It is the judgment of the Court Eddington's complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as to his claims against SCDC. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed this 23rd day of April 2026, in Columbia, South Carolina. s/ Mary Geiger Lewis

MARY GEIGER LEWIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Eddington is hereby notified of his 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.