

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

John Lionel Constance, Jr., individually and as father and next friend
of L.G.C. v. South Carolina Department of Social Services, Edward
Moore, John Does 1-25

Constance v. South Carolina Department of Social Services · No. 6:26-196-BHH · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviews a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. Finding no clear error and agreeing that Plaintiff failed to make the required showing under Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., the Court adopts the Report and denies the motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bruce H. Hendricks
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	6:26-196-BHH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. A magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending denial. The district court reviewed the recommendation after no objections were filed and adopted it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error on the face of the record rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- injunctions
- equitable relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure injunctions equitable relief family law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party files specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated entitlement to a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific objections are filed, the district court reviews the magistrate judge's recommendation for clear error rather than conducting a de novo review.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction because he failed to make the requisite clear showing of the elements necessary for such relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.’” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff John Lionel Constance, Jr., individually and as father and next friend of his minor child L.G.C., sought a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction against the South Carolina Department of Social Services, Edward Moore, and John Does 1-25. The opinion does not provide substantive facts underlying the requested injunction. The court concluded that Plaintiff had not made the requisite clear showing of the elements necessary for either form of injunctive relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B) (D.S.C.). The magistrate judge recommended denying Plaintiff's motion because Plaintiff had not made the clear showing required for preliminary injunctive relief. No objections were filed, so the district court reviewed the Report for clear error, found none, adopted the Report, and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-south-carol/2026/john-lionel-constance-jr-individually-and-as-father-and-bulyqle0>