

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

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 al., : 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/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-oh/2026/terrance-j-feaster-v-annette-chambers-smith-et-al-gjbvfrac>