

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Maurice L. Bellamy v. S.C. Attorney General et al.

Civil Action No. 9:25-cv-1529-BHH (D.S.C. Mar. 9, 2026) · No. 9:25-cv-1529-BHH · Decided March 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviewed a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning motions filed by pro se plaintiff Maurice L. Bellamy. Finding no clear error and no objections to the report, the court adopted the recommendation and denied the plaintiff’s motions for relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bruce H. Hendricks
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	March 9, 2026
DOCKET	9:25-cv-1529-BHH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation concerning Plaintiff's motions for various relief in a pro se civil-rights action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error; specific objections would require de novo review of the challenged portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order adopting a magistrate judge's report and recommendation.
PARTIES	Maurice L. Bellamy v. S.C. Attorney General, The State of South Carolina, The S.C. Dept of Corrections, The S.C.D.C. General Counsel, Bryan Stirling, The S.C.D.C. Director of Medical, Warden James, A. W. Smith, A. W. McDuffy, Major Meeks, Sgt. Crowley, Nurse Miller, Warden Stonebreaker, The United States Congress, The Catholic Arch Diocese and The Pope, Mr. Lawrenz, The Well Path Center, The 194 Member States of the United Nations, The County of

TOPICS

civil procedure prisoners rights section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights prisoners rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's report and recommendation for clear error because no specific objections were filed.
2. Whether the court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation and deny Plaintiff's motions requesting various relief.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific objections are filed, the district court reviews the magistrate judge's report and recommendation for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
2. The court found no clear error in the magistrate judge's analysis, adopted and incorporated the Report, and denied all of Plaintiff's motions requesting various relief.

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.'" (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Maurice L. Bellamy, proceeding pro se, filed a civil-rights complaint naming numerous governmental, institutional, and individual defendants. The complaint was initially filed jointly with three other inmates but was later divided into four separate actions. The magistrate judge considered Plaintiff's various motions and recommended that all be denied; Plaintiff filed no objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff and three other inmates originally filed a single complaint in case number 9:24-cv-4660-BHH-MHC. On March 10, 2025, the Court directed that the complaint be divided into four separate actions, including this case. The magistrate judge recommended denying all of Plaintiff's motions. Plaintiff received notice of his right to object but filed no objections. The district court reviewed the Report for clear error, adopted it, and denied the motions.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Maurice L. Bellamy,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 9:25-cv-1529-BHH v.)) ORDER S.C.
Attorney General, The State of) South Carolina, The S.C. Dept of) Corrections, The S.C.D.C.
General) Counsel, Bryan Stirling, The S.C.D.C.) Director of Medical, Warden James,) A. W.
Smith, A. W. McDuffy, Major) Meeks, Sgt.

Crowley, Nurse Miller,) Warden Stonebreaker, The United) States Congress, The Catholic Arch)
Diocese and The Pope, Mr. Lawrenz,) The Well Path Center, The 194) Member States of the
United Nations,) The County of Richland, SC, The) County of Kershaw, The County of) Horry,
Adair F. Burroughs, The United) States Senate,)) Defendant.)
_____) This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Maurice L.
Bellamy's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint.¹ 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 February 17, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report"),
outlining the procedural history of this case and considering the various motions filed by Plaintiff.
(ECF No. 35.) After reviewing various pleadings, the Magistrate Judge 1 As the Magistrate Judge
explained in her Report, the complaint was originally filed by Plaintiff and three other inmates as a
single action in case number 9:24-cv-4660-BHH-MHC, but on March 10, 2025, the Court directed
that the complaint be filed in four separate actions.

(See ECF No. 35 at 3.) recommended that the Court deny all of Plaintiff's motions requesting
various relief. (See id. at 2-7.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising
Plaintiff 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, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and fully agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis.

Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 35), and the Court denies all of Plaintiff’s motions requesting various relief (ECF Nos. 23, 24, and 27). 2 IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Bruce H. Hendricks United States District Judge March 9, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 3