

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

Rickel Marquavius Jefferies v. Cedric D. Cheatham and Greenville
County

Jefferies · No. 6:25-cv-13858-TMC · Decided April 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina addresses objections to a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in a pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action brought by a pretrial detainee. The court dismisses claims against Greenville County and any speedy-trial claim with prejudice, declines injunctive relief concerning ongoing state criminal proceedings under Younger abstention, and grants leave to file a second amended complaint concerning specified claims for monetary damages. The court also denies requests under 42 U.S.C. § 14141 and 28 U.S.C. § 1446 and directs the plaintiff to file the second amended complaint within 21 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Timothy M. Cain
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
DECIDED	April 24, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-13858-TMC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a pro se pretrial detainee proceeding in forma pauperis, brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. After a magistrate judge recommended dismissal without further leave to amend and without issuance and service of process, the district court reviewed the recommendation and Plaintiff's objections and motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews de novo those portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objections are made; general or conclusory objections do not require de novo review. In the absence of specific objections, the court reviews the record for clear error.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Rickel Marquavius Jefferies v. Cedric D. Cheatham, Greenville County

TOPICS

[motion to amend](#)
[section 1983](#)
[injunctions](#)
[civil procedure](#)
[fourth amendment](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)
[civil rights](#)
[criminal procedure](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the action.
2. Whether Younger abstention barred Plaintiff's requests for injunctive relief concerning his ongoing state criminal proceedings.
3. Whether Plaintiff's allegations against Greenville County stated a claim.
4. Whether Plaintiff's Sixth Amendment speedy-trial claim could proceed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
5. Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave to file a second amended complaint to add factual allegations supporting his damages claims.
6. Whether Plaintiff could pursue relief under 34 U.S.C. § 12601 or remove his state criminal prosecution under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1446 or 1455.

HOLDINGS

1. The claims against Greenville County were dismissed with prejudice because Plaintiff made no substantive allegations against the County and his subsequent filings did not cure that deficiency.
2. The court would not grant injunctive relief, including a request to dismiss Plaintiff's state criminal charges, because the ongoing state proceedings satisfied Younger and Plaintiff failed to establish an applicable exception.
3. Any Sixth Amendment speedy-trial claim was dismissed with prejudice.
4. Plaintiff was granted leave to file a second amended complaint containing all claims and allegations he wished the court to consider.
5. Plaintiff's motion under the former 42 U.S.C. § 14141, now codified at 34 U.S.C. § 12601, was denied, and his request to remove the state criminal prosecution was denied as untimely and unavailable under the asserted statutory basis.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court has reviewed the filings in this case and concludes Plaintiff has failed to meet his burden of showing an exception to Younger applies.” (at 8-10)

“Plaintiff shall file his second amended complaint on the proper form within 21 days, and that second amended complaint must be compliant with the instructions set forth herein.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was a pretrial detainee facing ongoing criminal proceedings in the Greenville County Court of General Sessions. He alleged claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 involving unreasonable search and seizure, false arrest or false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, excessive force, fabrication of evidence, due process, and a speedy trial. In later filings, he alleged that Defendant Cheatham lied in an arrest warrant and forced Plaintiff's hands behind his back while handcuffing him.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was referred to a magistrate judge, who gave Plaintiff opportunities to bring the action into proper form and received an amended complaint. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation as modified in part, dismissed the claims against Greenville County and the speedy-trial claim with prejudice, denied injunctive relief relating to the pending state prosecution, granted leave to file a second amended complaint, and denied or dismissed the other motions as specified in the order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wimmer v. Cook, 774 F.2d 68, 72 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Farmer v. McBride, 177 Fed. App'x 327, 330-31 (4th Cir. 2006)
- Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)
- Elijah v. Dunbar, 66 F.4th 454, 460 (4th Cir. 2023)
- United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007)
- Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1019 (7th Cir. 1988)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Greenspan v. Brothers Property Corp., 103 F. Supp. 3d 734, 737 (D.S.C. 2015)
- Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983)
- Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Stratton v. Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services, 521 Fed. App'x 278, 290 (4th Cir. 2013)
- Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277-78 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971)
- Martin Marietta Corp. v. Maryland Commission on Human Relations, 38 F.3d 1392, 1396 (4th Cir. 1994)
- Wood v. Olejasz, No. 1:21-cv-103, 2021 WL 4450270, at *3 (N.D.W. Va. Aug. 10, 2021)

- Suggs v. Brannon, 804 F.2d 274, 278 (4th Cir. 1986)
- Salartash, No. 3:25-cv-4 (RCY), 2025 WL 711960, at *7
- Gilbert v. North Carolina State Bar, 660 F. Supp. 2d 636, 644 (E.D.N.C. 2009)
- Erie Insurance Exchange v. Maryland Insurance Administration, 105 F.4th 145, 153 n.3 (4th Cir. 2024)
- Pilgrim v. Delaney, No. 7:20-CV-02325-DCC, 2021 WL 274301, at *1 (D.S.C. Jan. 27, 2021)
- Nivens v. Gilchrist, 444 F.3d 237, 248-50 (4th Cir. 2006)
- Brazell v. Boyd, 991 F.2d 787 (4th Cir. 1993)
- Robinson v. South Carolina Department of Public Safety, No. 8:05-CV-3198-SB-JDA, 2011 WL 1225727, at *1 (D.S.C. Feb. 28, 2011)
- Starks v. Moore, 51 F. Supp. 3d 782, 797 (S.D. Ind. 2014)
- Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 522 (1972)
- Matrix Capital Management Fund, LP v. BearingPoint, Inc., 576 F.3d 172, 193 (4th Cir. 2009)
- Young v. City of Mount Ranier, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001)
- Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389 (2015)
- McClary v. Searles, No. 3:15cv77FDW, 2015 WL 2259312, at *1 n.1 (W.D.N.C. May 13, 2015)
- Robinson v. City of Conway, No. 4:24-5448-JD-KDW, 2025 WL 1852267, at *3 (D.S.C. Feb. 21, 2025)