

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

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.