

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Solomon Jackson v. C.J. Olson

Jackson v. Olson · No. 3:25-cv-13416-CMC · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismisses Solomon Jackson’s matter without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The court found no clear error after Plaintiff failed to file objections to the Report.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cameron McGowan Currie
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	March 25, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-13416-CMC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff filed no objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of timely specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the Report for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Solomon Jackson v. C.J. Olson

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the matter without prejudice and without issuance and service of process should be adopted.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only review the Report and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record rather than conduct de novo review.
2. The court adopted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the matter without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

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

The matter arose from Plaintiff's filing of a Notice of Removal accompanied by a Richland County Sheriff's Department incident report concerning a stolen vehicle. The opinion does not describe additional underlying facts or the merits of any claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a Notice of Removal and a Richland County Sheriff's Department incident report concerning a stolen vehicle on November 17, 2025. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, who recommended dismissal without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. After the objection period expired without objections, the district court reviewed the Report for clear error, adopted it, and dismissed the matter.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

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
COLUMBIA DIVISION Solomon Jackson, Civil Action No. 3:25-cv-13416-CMC Plaintiff, vs.

ORDER C.J. Olson, Defendant. This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's "Notice of Removal" along with a Richland County Sheriff's Department incident report concerning a stolen vehicle, filed November 17, 2025.

Dkt. No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings. On February 26, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending this matter be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Dkt. No. 17. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections, and the time in which 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 the court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976).

The court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

The court is required to review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. 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.") (citation omitted).

After a review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error, and agrees this matter should be dismissed. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report by reference in this Order. This matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/Cameron McGowan Currie CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE Senior United States District Judge Columbia, South Carolina March 25, 2026 2