

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Louis A. Dorff, Jr. v. Sonia E. Turner and Taylor-Marie Turner

No. 6:25-cv-4000-BHH, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina (April 29, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviewed a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. The court found no clear error, adopted the report, granted summary judgment only on Plaintiff’s aiding-and-abetting breach of fiduciary duty claim against Taylor-Marie Turner, and denied the motion as to all other claims.

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	April 29, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-4000-BHH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought claims under South Carolina and Florida law. Defendant Sonia E. Turner moved for summary judgment, and Defendant Taylor-Marie Turner moved to join and adopt that motion. After the Magistrate Judge recommended partial summary judgment and no party objected, 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 the report and record for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation.

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review governs a magistrate judge's report and recommendation when no party files specific objections?
2. Whether Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's claims, including the fourth cause of action for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty against Taylor-Marie Turner.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party files specific objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court reviews the report and record for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
2. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment only on Plaintiff's fourth cause of action alleging aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty against Taylor-Marie Turner; summary judgment was denied as to all other claims.

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.'" (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Louis A. Dorff, Jr. asserted claims under South Carolina and Florida law against Sonia E. Turner and Taylor-Marie Turner. Sonia moved for summary judgment, and Taylor-Marie sought to join and adopt that motion. The order does not recite the underlying substantive facts because it resolves the motion by adopting the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation after clear-error review.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Magistrate Judge granted Taylor-Marie Turner's motion to join and adopt Sonia Turner's summary-judgment motion to the extent the arguments and evidence supported judgment as to all claims against Taylor-Marie. The Magistrate Judge recommended granting summary judgment only on Plaintiff's fourth cause of action, aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty against Taylor-Marie, and denying summary judgment on all other claims. No objections were filed, so the District Court reviewed the Report for clear error, found none, adopted and incorporated the Report, and granted the motion in part and denied it in part.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976)

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

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Louis A. Dorff, Jr.,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 6:25-cv-4000-BHH v.)) ORDER Sonia E.
Turner and Taylor-Marie) Turner,)) Defendants.) _____)
Plaintiff Louis A. Dorff, Jr. (“Plaintiff”) filed this action against Defendants Sonia E. Turner
 (“Sonia”) and Taylor-Marie Turner (“Taylor-Marie”) (collectively, “Defendants”) alleging claims
under South Carolina and Florida law.

(ECF No. 1.) On January 28, 2026, Sonia, who is represented by counsel, filed a motion for
summary judgment. (ECF No. 68.) The next day, Taylor-Marie, who is proceeding pro se, filed a
“motion to join and adopt” Sonia’s motion. (ECF No. 73.)

The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations. On
April 8, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a text order granting Taylor-Marie’s motion to join and
adopt to the extent that the Court considers all arguments and evidence submitted with Sonia’s
motion for summary judgment as supporting summary judgment as to all claims against Taylor-
Marie.

(ECF No. 84.) The same day, the Magistrate Judge also issued a report and recommendation
 (“Report”), outlining the summary judgment issues and recommending that the Court grant in part
and deny in part deny Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 85.) Specifically, the
Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court deny the motion as to all claims against Defendants
aside from Plaintiff’s fourth cause of action alleging aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty
against Taylor-Marie.

Thus, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the motion for summary judgment be granted only
as to the aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty claim against Taylor-Marie. (ECF No. 85.)
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 party has filed objections to the Report, the Court has reviewed the record and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and fully agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s careful and thorough analysis. 2 Accordingly, the Court adopts and specifically incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 85), and the Court grants in part and denies in part Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 68).

Specifically, the Court grants the motion only as to Plaintiff’s fourth cause of action alleging aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty against Taylor-Marie, and the Court denies the motion as to all other claims. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/Bruce H. Hendricks United States District Judge
April 28, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 3