

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

**Derrick DL Brunson v. Investigator Alvin Worsley, Florence County
Sheriff's Office**

Brunson · No. 4:24-cv-00207-JDA · Decided March 31, 2026

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION Derrick DL Brunson,) Case No. 4:24-cv-00207-JDA) Plaintiff,)) v.) OPINION AND ORDER) Investigator Alvin Worsley, Florence) County Sheriffs Office,)) Defendants.) This matter is before the Court on a motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants. [Doc.

64.] 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 Judge Kaymani D. West for pre-trial proceedings. On January 23, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted. [Doc. 111.]

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. [Id. at 20.] Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time to do so has lapsed.¹ The Clerk docketed a letter from Plaintiff on March 18, 2026, stating, among other things, that he lacks access to paper to file timely objections.

[Doc. 123.] The letter does not contain a specific request for an extension. [See generally id.] Because the Court has granted Plaintiff extensions on two prior occasions [see Docs. 115; 120], it declines to do so a third time.

The Clerk docketed another letter from Plaintiff on March 19, 2026. [Doc. 124.] Therein, Plaintiff purports to submit documents that were provided to the Magistrate Judge for consideration and subsequently “overlooked.” [Id. at 2.]

However, Plaintiff makes no specific objections to the Report. [See generally id.] 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, 271 (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)).

Out of an abundance of caution for the pro se Plaintiff, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report, the record, and the applicable law. Upon such review, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference.

Accordingly, Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [Doc. 64] is GRANTED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge March 31, 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.