

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

Isaiah Jacob Holmes v. Quandara Grant, Dana Aiken, Sergeant
Black, Officer Joseph, Sergeant Bush, and Dr. Garmen

Civil Action No. 4:24-3255-MGL-TER · No. 4:24-3255-MGL-TER · Decided February 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation after the plaintiff filed no objections. The court granted summary judgment to Defendants Quandara Grant, Sergeant Black, Officer Joseph, and Sergeant Bush, dismissing the claims against them with prejudice, while noting that claims against Dana Aiken had previously been dismissed and Defendant Dr. Garmen’s summary-judgment motion remained pending.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mary Geiger Lewis
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
DECIDED	February 3, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-3255-MGL-TER
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending summary judgment for Defendants Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush. Plaintiff filed no objections. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation, granted summary judgment for those defendants, and dismissed the claims against them with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and instead must satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation. If specific objections are filed, the district court conducts a de novo determination of the challenged portions.

TOPICS

summary judgment

standard of review

appellate procedure

section 1983

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when a party fails to object to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant summary judgment to Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush and dismiss the claims against them.

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 may accept the recommendation after determining that no clear error appears on the face of the record.
2. Summary judgment is granted to Defendants Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush, and the claims against those defendants are dismissed with prejudice.
3. A party's failure to file timely objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation waives appellate review.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"[I]n 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.'"

"It is therefore the judgment of the Court Defendants Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush's motion for summary judgment is GRANTED and the claims against those Defendants are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Holmes, proceeding without counsel, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against six defendants. The magistrate judge recommended granting summary judgment to Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush. Holmes did not object to the recommendation, and the district court adopted it and dismissed the claims against those four defendants with prejudice.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Holmes filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Grant, Aiken, Black, Joseph, Bush, and Garmen. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation on January 16, 2026, recommending that summary judgment be granted to Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush. Holmes filed no objections. The district court adopted the recommendation, granted summary judgment to those defendants, and dismissed the claims against them with prejudice; the court noted that claims against Aiken had previously been dismissed and that Garmen's summary-judgment motion remained pending.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION ISAAH JACOB HOLMES, § Plaintiff, § § VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO.
4:24-3255-MGL-TER § QUANDARA GRANT, DANA AIKEN, § SERGEANT BLACK,
OFFICER § JOSEPH, SERGEANT BUSH, and § DR. GARMEN, § Defendants. § ORDER
ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND GRANTING SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AS TO CERTAIN DEFENDANTS AND DISMISSING THEM FROM THIS
LAWSUIT Plaintiff Isaiah Jacob Holmes (Holmes), who is self represented, filed this 42 U.S.C. §
1983 lawsuit against Defendants Quandara Grant (Grant), Dana Aiken (Aiken), Sergeant Black
(Black), Officer Joseph (Joseph), Sergeant Bush (Bush), and Dr. Garmen (Garmen).

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Defendants Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush's motion for summary judgment be granted and the claims against those Defendants be dismissed from this lawsuit.

The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight.

The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on January 16, 2026, but Holmes failed file any objections. “[I]n 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.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc.*

Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore the judgment of the Court Defendants Grant, Black, Joseph, and Bush’s motion for summary judgment is GRANTED and the claims against those Defendants are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. The Court earlier dismissed the claims against Aiken, and Garmen has filed a motion for summary judgment. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed this 3rd day of February, 2026, in Columbia, South Carolina. s/ Mary Geiger Lewis MARY GEIGER LEWIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE ***** NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL Holmes is hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.