

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.

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.