

**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.

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.