

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA**

Mary Pressley v. 21st Mortgage

No. 6:25-13312-BHH, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina (December 8, 2025)

OPINION

Mary Pressley v. 21st Mortgage

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary Pressley,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 6:25-13312-BHH v.)

) ORDER

21st Mortgage,)) Defendants.) _____) This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Mary Pressley’s (“Plaintiff”) motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 4.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review. On November 13, 2025, Magistrate Judge William S. Brown issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action and deny Plaintiff’s motion. (ECF No.8.) In the Report, the Magistrate Judge explained that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims. Additionally, the Magistrate Judge explained that abstention is appropriate under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. (Id.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error.

After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 8); the Court denies Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 4) and dismisses this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Bruce H. Hendricks United States District Judge December 8, 2025 Charleston, South Carolina 2