

**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.

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 vy. 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