

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA**

**M-EDIF, Members of EDIF; W. MJ Boyd, Founder also known as
Wanda Boyd v. Donald J. Trump, President, et al.**

M-EDIF · No. 2:26-1467-RMG · Decided May 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina dismisses without prejudice and without issuance or service of process a pro se plaintiff's action brought on behalf of Sean Combs. The court adopts the magistrate judge's recommendation that the claims are frivolous but declines at this time to impose a pre-filing injunction, while warning that future sanctions may be considered.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA M-EDIF, Members of EDIF; W. MJ Boyd, Case No. 2:26-1467-RMG Founder also known as Wanda Boyd, Plaintiff, v. ORDER AND OPINION Donald J. Trump, President, et al., Defendants. This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 10) recommending that this action be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

The R&R further recommends a pre-filing injunction against Plaintiff. For the reasons stated below, the Court dismisses this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. I. Background Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. Plaintiff attempts to bring this action in a representative capacity but cannot as a pro se litigant.

(Dkt. No. 10 at 2). Thus, the Court construes Plaintiff’s complaint only as to herself, not “M-EDIF.” Plaintiff sues various defendants for relief for “Sean P Diddy Combs” and seeks to have “case by trial to restore the civil and human rights of Mr. Combs.” (Id.). Plaintiff lists “n/a” for damages. (Id.).

On April 10, 2026, the Magistrate Judge filed an R&R recommending dismissal of this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Id.) (concluding Plaintiff’s allegations are “frivolous”). The R&R further recommended a pre-filing injunction against 1 Plaintiff. (Id. at 3-6).

The R&R notes four recent frivolous actions Plaintiff has filed just this year. (Id.). The R&R recommends a pre-filing injunction directing the Clerk not to accept any filing where Plaintiff is not pursuing claims with herself as Plaintiff. (Id. at 5). Plaintiff did not file objections to the R&R.

II. Legal Standards A. Magistrate's Report and Recommendation The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court.

The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (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). B. Pro Se Pleadings This Court liberally construes complaints filed by pro se litigants to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. See *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).

The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleadings to allege facts which set forth a viable federal claim, nor can the Court assume the existence of a genuine issue of material fact where none exists. See *Weller v. Dep't of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). III. Discussion Though Plaintiff did not file objections to the R&R, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the record and finds that the Magistrate Judge ably summarized the factual and legal 2 issues in this matter and correctly concluded that this action should be dismissed without prejudice and without service of process.

(Dkt. No. 10 at 1-2). The Court adopts this portion of the R&R. Plaintiff's action on behalf of Sean Combs against the President and others is clearly frivolous. At this juncture, however, the Court declines to issue a pre-filing injunction against Plaintiff. Plaintiff is explicitly warned, however, that the Court may consider sanctions at a future date if Plaintiff's pattern of conduct persists.

Conclusion For the reasons set forth above, the Court DISMISSES this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. AND IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Richard Mark Gergel
Richard Mark Gergel United States District Judge May 6, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 3