

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Craig Ninja Antonio Brewton v. Brady Branson, III and Marcus L.
White

Brewton · No. 7:25-cv-10435-RMG · Decided April 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The court adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 excessive-force action arising from plaintiff’s arrest. The court found that the force used against plaintiff, who was resisting arrest, was reasonable and that defendants were entitled to qualified immunity; plaintiff’s summary-judgment and amendment motions were denied.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard Mark Gergel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	April 2, 2026
DOCKET	7:25-cv-10435-RMG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation on cross-motions for summary judgment and Plaintiff's motion to amend after Plaintiff filed no objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error rather than conducting de novo review. The district court may accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge's recommendations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Craig Ninja Antonio Brewton v. Brady Branson, III, Marcus L. White

TOPICS

- section 1983
- qualified immunity
- police misconduct
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's § 1983 excessive-force claim.
2. Whether Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity because the record showed no constitutional violation.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motions for summary judgment should be denied.
4. Whether Plaintiff's post-discovery motion to amend the Complaint to add defendants should be denied as untimely, futile, and prejudicial.
5. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after no party filed objections.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because the force used to place Plaintiff, who was actively resisting arrest, on the ground was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances and therefore did not violate the Constitution.
2. Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity because Plaintiff failed to establish a constitutional violation.
3. Plaintiff's motion to amend the Complaint to add defendants was properly denied because it was filed after the close of discovery, was futile, and would prejudice Defendants.
4. Because no party filed specific objections, the district court was required only to satisfy itself that no clear error appeared on the face of the record before adopting the Report and Recommendation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Where the petitioner fails to timely file any specific objections, "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 drove away after Deputy White attempted a traffic stop for a seat-belt violation and continued fleeing until he pulled over. Plaintiff ignored commands to remain in the vehicle and resisted arrest after the deputies attempted to arrest him based on the blue-light violation, failure to follow commands, and the reported smell of marijuana. The deputies forced Plaintiff to the ground, handcuffed him, and transported him for medical evaluation; diagnostic imaging and later x-rays revealed no acute injuries. The encounter lasted less than one minute and was recorded on the deputies' body cameras.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a pro se pretrial detainee, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that two deputy sheriffs used excessive force during his arrest. After discovery, Plaintiff and Defendants moved for summary judgment, and Plaintiff moved to add additional defendants. The magistrate judge recommended granting Defendants' summary-judgment motion and denying Plaintiff's motions. Because no party objected, the district court conducted clear-error review, adopted the Report and Recommendation, granted Defendants' motion for summary judgment, and denied Plaintiff's motions for summary judgment and to amend.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971)
- Cruz v. Beto, 405 U.S. 319, 322 (1972)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972)
- Weller v. Department of Social Services, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990)