

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Thomas V. Lampley v. Scotty Bodiford

Lampley v. Bodiford · No. 2:26-cv-00027-JDA · Decided March 12, 2026

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION Thomas V. Lampley,) Case No. 2:26-cv-00027-JDA)
Petitioner,)) v.) OPINION AND ORDER) Scotty Bodiford,)) Respondent.)) This matter is
before the Court on Petitioner’s Petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241
and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the Magistrate Judge.

[Docs. 1; 6.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.),
this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for pre-trial
proceedings. On January 6, 2026, the Clerk docketed a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed pro
se by a state pretrial detainee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. [Doc. 1.]

On February 11, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending summary dismissal of
the Petition because the action was barred by *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). [Doc. 6.] The
Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the
Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. [Id. at 8.]

Petitioner has not filed objections or otherwise responded to the Report, and the time to do so has
lapsed. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation
has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the
Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976).

The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the
Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify,
in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to
the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond
v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.*, 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” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the
Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as modified and incorporates it by reference to the extent consistent with this Order.

Accordingly, the Petition is DISMISSED with prejudice, not on the merits, under *Younger*. See *Nivens v. Gilchrist*, 444 F.3d 237, 247 (4th Cir. 2006). CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY “The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases; see Rule 1(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (stating that a district court may apply these rules to a habeas petition not filed pursuant to § 2254).

A certificate of appealability will not issue absent “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong.

Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484–85.

In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge March 12, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina