

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

Earnest Vaughn, Sr. a/k/a Earnest E. Vaughn a/k/a Earnest Edward
Vaughn a/k/a Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr. v. SCDC Health Services,
Roxanne LaPointe, D. Phillips, S. Wachter, N. McFadden, Ofc.
Bowman, Dr. Way

Vaughn v. SCDC Health Services · No. 6:25-cv-13381-JDA-KFM · Decided December 10, 2025

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 preliminary injunction in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. After conducting de novo review of the objections, record, and applicable law, the Court adopts the recommendation and denies the motion. The order also provides notice of Plaintiff’s right to appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	6:25-cv-13381-JDA-KFM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction in a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After the magistrate judge recommended denial and Plaintiff filed objections, the district court conducted de novo review and ruled on the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts de novo review of portions of a magistrate judge's report to which specific objections are made; absent a specific objection, review is for clear error. The court independently reviewed the report, record, and applicable law de novo.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Earnest Vaughn, Sr. a/k/a Earnest E. Vaughn a/k/a Earnest Edward Vaughn a/k/a Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr. v. SCDC Health Services, Roxanne LaPointe, D. Phillips, S. Wachter, N. McFadden, Ofc. Bowman, Dr. Way

TOPICS

injunctions

section 1983

prisoners rights

civil rights

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

civil procedure

preliminary injunctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction should be accepted after review of Plaintiff's objections.
2. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits sufficient to warrant preliminary injunctive relief.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court must conduct a de novo determination of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is made, while clear-error review is sufficient in the absence of a specific objection.
2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction was denied because he failed to show that he was likely to succeed on the merits of his claims.

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” (416 F.3d at 315)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and apparently incarcerated, brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against SCDC Health Services and several individual defendants. He sought a preliminary injunction, but the magistrate judge concluded that he had not demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits. The district court's order does not recount the underlying factual allegations in detail.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint and motion for a preliminary injunction on November 12, 2025. The magistrate judge recommended denying the injunction because Plaintiff had not shown a likelihood of success

on the merits. Plaintiff objected, and the district court conducted a de novo review before accepting the recommendation and denying the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION) Earnest Vaughn, Sr.) Case No. 6:25-cv-13381-JDA-KFM a/k/a Earnest E. Vaughn) a/k/a Earnest Edward Vaughn) a/k/a Earnest Edward Vaughn, Sr.,) OPINION AND ORDER) Plaintiff,)) v.)) SCDC Health Services, Roxanne) LaPointe, D. Phillips, S. Wachter,) N. McFadden, Ofc.

Bowman,) Dr. Way,)) Defendants.) This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction. [Doc. 4.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre- trial proceedings.

On November 12, 2025, the Clerk docketed Plaintiff’s Complaint brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and his motion for a preliminary injunction. [Docs. 1; 4.] On November 21, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion be denied because Plaintiff has not shown that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims. [Doc. 9.]

The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. [Id. at 5.] The Clerk docketed objections from Plaintiff on December 9, 2025. [Doc. 12.]

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976).

The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

In his objections, Plaintiff largely fails to engage the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. [See generally Doc. 12.] Nonetheless, out of an abundance of caution for the pro se Plaintiff, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report, the record, and the applicable law. Upon such review, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference.

[Doc. 9.] Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction [Doc. 4] is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge December 10, 2025 Greenville, South Carolina NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL Plaintiff is hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.