

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Robert L. Rawlinson v. Will Anderson, Nurse Barnett, Jason Leblanc

Rawlinson · No. 0:26-cv-826-SAL · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation because the plaintiff filed no objections and the court found no clear error. The court dismisses the plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action without prejudice and without issuance or service of process for failure to allege a plausible claim against certain defendants and failure to make allegations concerning another defendant.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherri A. Lydon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	0:26-cv-826-SAL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of a self-represented pretrial detainee's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff filed no objections, and the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error and need not provide an explanation beyond satisfying itself that no clear error appears on the face of the record. Portions specifically objected to are reviewed de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation
PARTIES	Robert L. Rawlinson v. Will Anderson, Nurse Barnett, Jason Leblanc

TOPICS

section 1983

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review and adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed because the complaint failed to allege a plausible 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim against Anderson and Leblanc and contained no allegations concerning Barnett.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed, the district court need only determine whether there is clear error on the face of the record before accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation.
2. The action was properly dismissed without prejudice because the complaint failed to allege facts supporting a plausible § 1983 claim against Anderson and Leblanc and contained no allegations concerning Barnett.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Finding no clear error in the Report, ECF No. 15, it is adopted and incorporated.”

“For the reasons discussed in the Report, this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Robert L. Rawlinson, a self-represented state pretrial detainee, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Will Anderson, Nurse Barnett, and Jason Leblanc. The Report and Recommendation concluded that the complaint failed to allege facts supporting a plausible § 1983 claim against Anderson and Leblanc and contained no allegations concerning Barnett.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Anderson, Barnett, and Leblanc. Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett recommended dismissal because the allegations did not state a plausible claim against Anderson and Leblanc and contained no allegations concerning Barnett. After Plaintiff failed to object within the allotted time, the district court found no clear error, adopted the Report, and dismissed the action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Rawlinson

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert L. Rawlinson, C/A No. 0:26-cv-826-SAL Plaintiff, v.

ORDER

Will Anderson, Nurse Barnett, Jason Leblanc, Defendants. Plaintiff, a self-represented state pretrial detainee, brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of a Report and Recommendation by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett (the “Report”), made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B) (D.S.C.). [ECF No. 15.] The Report recommends dismissal of this action because Plaintiff fails to allege facts supporting a plausible § 1983 claim as to Defendants Anderson and Leblanc and because there are no allegations concerning Defendant Barnett. *Id.* at 3–5. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the consequences of failing to respond. *Id.* at

6. Plaintiff has not objected to the Report, and the time to do so has expired.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and 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) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Finding no clear error in the Report, ECF No. 15, it is adopted and incorporated. For the reasons discussed in the Report, this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS. IT IS SO ORDERED.** Sherr tk. May 27, 2026 Sherr A. en Columbia, South Carolina
United States District Judge