

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA

Griffin v. Patterson, Hough, Meyers, Turner, and Gilreath

Griffin · No. 0:25-13095-MGL · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation after Plaintiff Terrance Griffin filed no objections. The court dismissed Griffin’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint without prejudice and without issuance or service of process, and notified him of his right to appeal.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of South Carolina                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Mary Geiger Lewis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of South Carolina                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DECIDED               | February 19, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| DOCKET                | 0:25-13095-MGL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | A self-represented state prisoner brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.                                                                                                                   |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | When specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court conducts de novo review of the challenged portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine whether there is clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PARTIES               | Terrance Griffin v. Dennis Patterson, Pamela Hough, John/Jane Doe Meyers, John Doe Turner, Matthew Gilreath                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

appellate procedure

standard of review

civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

appellate procedure

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when a party files no objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the court should adopt the Report and Recommendation and dismiss the § 1983 complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

## HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need not conduct de novo review and instead must satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and dismissed the complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.
3. A failure to object to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation waives appellate review.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“It is therefore the judgment of the Court this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE and without issuance and service of process.”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Terrance Griffin, a self-represented state prisoner, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Dennis Patterson, Pamela Hough, John/Jane Doe Meyers, John Doe Turner, and Matthew Gilreath. The opinion does not set out the underlying factual allegations or the substantive grounds for dismissal because the district court adopted and incorporated the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge filed the Report and Recommendation on January 27, 2026. Plaintiff filed no objections. The district court reviewed the record, adopted the Report and Recommendation, and dismissed the complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976)

- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985)

## OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
 ROCK HILL DIVISION TERRANCE GRIFFIN, § Plaintiff, § § VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 0:25-  
 13095-MGL § § DENNIS PATTERSON, PAMELA HOUGH, § JOHN/JANE DOE MEYERS,  
 JOHN DOE § TURNER, and MATTHEW GILREATH, § Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING  
 THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DISMISSING THE COMPLAINT WITHOUT  
 PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS Plaintiff Terrance  
 Griffin (Griffin) who is a self-represented state prisoner, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against  
 Defendants Dennis Patterson, Pamela Hough, John/Jane Doe Meyers, John Doe Turner, and  
 Matthew Gilreath.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the  
 United States Magistrate Judge suggesting the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and  
 without issuance and service of process.

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 27, 2026, but Griffin  
 failed to 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 this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE and  
 without issuance and service of process. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed this 19th day of February,  
 2026 in Columbia, South Carolina. /s/ Mary Geiger Lewis MARY GEIGER LEWIS UNITED  
 STATES DISTRICT JUDGE \*\*\*\*\* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL Griffin 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.

2