

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, FLORENCE DIVISION

**Lauren Moe Morris a/k/a Lauren Moe Morris#289894 v. David L.
Douglas, K. Kelly, L. Farrar, A. Cadwallade**

Morris · No. 4:24-cv-01751-JDA · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after finding no clear error and no objections. The court granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment, dismissed the plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims with prejudice, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law battery claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-01751-JDA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted, the federal claims be dismissed, and supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law battery claim be declined. Neither party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of timely objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error. Specific objections would require de novo review of the objected-to portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

summary judgment

section 1983

civil rights

battery

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner civil rights

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation should be accepted after review for clear error when neither party filed objections.
2. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims.
3. Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's remaining state-law battery claim.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and must only determine whether the recommendation contains clear error on the face of the record.
2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment was granted, and Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims were dismissed with prejudice.
3. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's remaining state-law battery claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection." (Opinion and Order)

"Accordingly, Defendant's summary judgment motion [Doc. 65] is GRANTED, Plaintiff's § 1983 claims are dismissed with prejudice, and the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claim." (Opinion and Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides few substantive facts because it resolves the matter by adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, asserted several claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and a state-law battery claim against David L. Douglas, K. Kelly, L. Farrar, and A. Cadwallade. The court accepted the recommendation that defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the federal claims and that the remaining state-law claim should not be addressed through supplemental jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se § 1983 complaint on April 8, 2024, and an amended complaint on October 21, 2024, asserting several § 1983 claims and a state-law battery claim. Defendants moved for summary judgment on July 22, 2025. After receiving Plaintiff's response, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation on December 4, 2025. With no timely objections, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error,

accepted it, granted summary judgment, dismissed the § 1983 claims with prejudice, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the battery claim.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION Lauren Moe Morris a/k/a) Case No. 4:24-cv-01751-JDA
Lauren Moe Morris#289894,)) Plaintiff,)) OPINION AND ORDER v.)) David L. Douglas, K.
Kelly, L. Farrar,) A. Cadwallade,)) Defendants.) This matter is before the Court on Defendant’s
motion for summary judgment.

[Doc. 65.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings. Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint was docketed on April 8, 2024, and his pro se Amended Complaint was docketed on October 21, 2024. [Docs. 1; 37.]

In the Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges several claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and a state law battery claim. [Doc. 37 at 6.] On July 22, 2025, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. [Doc. 65.] On September 29, 2025, the Clerk docketed Plaintiff’s response opposing the motion. [Doc. 74.]

On December 4, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the motion be granted, that Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims be dismissed, and the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claim. [Doc. 78.]

The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. [Doc. 78-1.] Neither party has filed objections and the time to do so has lapsed.

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, 270–71 (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 will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 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” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference.

Accordingly, Defendant’s summary judgment motion [Doc. 65] is GRANTED, Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims are dismissed with prejudice, and the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claim. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge January 5, 2026 Florence, South Carolina NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.