

**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.

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.