

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

Terrance J. Feaster v. Annette Chambers-Smith, et al.

Feaster · No. 1:22-cv-453 · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Terrance J. Feaster’s request for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. Because Feaster filed no objections and the court found no clear error, it denied the requested injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	1:22-cv-453
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. After a magistrate judge recommended denying injunctive relief and plaintiff filed no objections, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, adopted it, and denied the requested relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, de novo review is not required; the district court may review the recommendation for clear error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Terrance J. Feaster v. Annette Chambers-Smith, et al.

TOPICS

- injunctions
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when the plaintiff filed no objections.
2. Whether the plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed, the district court is not required to conduct de novo review of the report and recommendation; the court may review it for clear error.
2. The Report and Recommendation recommending denial of Feaster's request for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order is adopted, and the request for injunctive relief is denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court reviewed the parties' filings on this matter and concludes that the Magistrate Judge made no clear error in recommending that Feaster's request for injunctive relief be denied."

"Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 99) is ADOPTED, and Feaster's request for a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order (Docs. 53-54) is DENIED."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Terrance J. Feaster is an inmate housed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. He requested a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order against the defendants. The magistrate judge recommended denying injunctive relief, and Feaster did not object to that recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Feaster requested a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order in the district court. Magistrate Judge Peter B. Silvain, Jr. issued a Report and Recommendation on December 30, 2025, recommending denial of injunctive relief. The deadline for objections was extended to February 13, 2026, but Feaster filed none. The district court concluded that the recommendation contained no clear error, adopted it, and denied the request.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985)
- Weir v. Centurion, No. 3:19-CV-00131, 2021 WL 5165930, at *1 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2021)

- Roane v. Warden of Corr. Reception Ctr., No. 2:22-CV-2768, 2022 WL 16535903, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 28, 2022)
- Lassiter v. Dullaghan, No. 1:10-CV-010, 2011 WL 110259, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 13, 2011)

OPINION

Feaster

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Terrance J. Feaster, : : Case No. 1:22-cv-453 Plaintiff, : : Judge Susan J. Dlott v. : : Order Adopting Report and Annette Chambers-Smith, et ai., : Recommendation and : Denying Injunctive Relief Defendants. : Plaintiff Terrance J. Feaster, an inmate housed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (“SOCF”), has requested that the Court issue a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. (Docs. 53-54.) Magistrate Judge Peter B. Silvain, Jr. issued a Report and Recommendation on December 30, 2025 recommending that his request for injunctive relief be denied. (Doc. 99.) The Magistrate Judge extended the deadline to file objections to the Report and Recommendation to February 13, 2026. (Doc. 102.) Feaster did not file objections. Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(1) authorize magistrate judges to make recommendations concerning dispositive motions that have been referred to them. When no objections are filed, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting § 636(b)(1)(C), intended to require a district judge to review [the] magistrate’s report.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); see also *Weir v. Centurion*, No. 3:19-CV-00131, 2021 WL 5165930, at *1 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2021) (“The district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made.”). Still, some district courts follow the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) and review the report and recommendation for clear error. See e.g., *Roane v. Warden of Corr. Reception Ctr.*, No. 2:22-CV-2768, 2022 WL 16535903, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 28, 2022); *Lassiter v. Dullaghan*, No. 1:10-CV-010, 2011 WL 110259, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 13, 2011). “The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (substantively similar). The Court reviewed the parties’ filings on this matter and concludes that the Magistrate Judge made no clear error in recommending that Feaster’s request for injunctive relief be denied. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 99) is ADOPTED, and Feaster’s request for a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order (Docs. 53-54) is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. BY THE COURT: tian: (ibis United States District Yudge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-ohio-united-states-district-court-for-the/2026/terrance-j-feaster-v-annette-chambers-smith-et-al-gjbyfrac>