

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

Stephanie Adcock v. Durham County

Adcock v. Durham County · No. 1:25-CV-6-DAB-LPA · Decided April 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s recommendation to grant the defendant’s motion to dismiss and deny the plaintiff’s motion for leave to amend. The court concluded that claims arising from state-court judgments were barred by a lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and that the remaining allegations failed to state a claim, dismissing the action without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David A. Bragdon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
DECIDED	April 24, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-6-DAB-LPA
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's memorandum opinion and recommendation, to which no party objected, and adopted the recommendation granting the motion to dismiss and denying leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Stephanie Adcock v. Durham County

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- motions to dismiss
- motion to amend
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation should be accepted when no party filed objections.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed because the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over claims arising from state court judgments and the remaining allegations failed to state a claim.
3. Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave to amend the original complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed, the district court must satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. Dismissal was warranted because the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over the claims arising from state court judgments and the remaining allegations failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.
3. Leave to amend the original complaint was denied because amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiff's complaint asserting claims arising from state court judgments, along with other allegations. The magistrate judge concluded that the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over the claims arising from those judgments and that the remaining allegations failed to state a claim. Plaintiff sought leave to amend the original complaint, but the magistrate judge recommended denial because amendment would be futile.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended granting Defendants' motion to dismiss because the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over claims arising from state court judgments and the remaining allegations failed to state a claim. The recommendation also advised denying Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend as futile. After the objection deadline passed without objections, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, adopted it, dismissed the action without prejudice, and directed that judgment be entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA STEPHANIE ADCOCK, Plaintiff, 1:25-CV-6-DAB-LPA v. DURHAM COUNTY, Defendant. ORDER This matter is before the Court for review of the Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation filed on March 31, 2026. 3/31/26 Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (D.E. 18).

The Magistrate Judge recommends granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (D.E. 9) because the Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over the Complaints' claims arising from state court judgments, and the remaining allegations fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and denying Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend the Original Complaint (D.E.

14) for futility. The deadline for objections passed on April 14, 2026, and no parties have objected to the Recommendation. Because there are no objections, the Court "must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir.

2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 72 advisory committee's note). This Court has accordingly reviewed the Recommendation and concludes it contains no clear error. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, 3/31/26 Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation, is ADOPTED, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED and Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend the Original Complaint is DENIED.

Further, this action is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order. This the 24th day of April, 2026. /s/ David A. Bragdon United States District Judge