

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, GREENVILLE DIVISION

Travis Scott McCall a/k/a Travis Scott McCall, Sr. v. Scotty Bodiford,
GCDC Administrator; James E. Hudson, Magistrate 13th Cir County
of Greenville, SC

McCall v. Bodiford · No. 6:25-cv-13422-JDA · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviewed a magistrate judge’s recommendation to dismiss Travis Scott McCall’s amended complaint against the Greenville County Detention Center administrator and a Greenville County magistrate. After conducting de novo review, the court adopted the recommendation and dismissed the action without issuance or service of process, without leave to amend, and without prejudice, citing pleading deficiencies and the Younger abstention doctrine.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-13422-JDA
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. After referral for pretrial proceedings, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal without issuance and service of process and without leave to amend. Plaintiff filed objections, and the district court conducted a de novo review before ruling on the Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts de novo review of portions of a magistrate judge’s report to which specific objections are made. In the absence of a timely objection, the court reviews for clear error before accepting the recommendation.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Travis Scott McCall a/k/a Travis Scott McCall, Sr. v. Scotty Bodiford, GCDC Administrator, James E. Hudson, Magistrate 13th Cir County of Greenville, SC

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when a party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the Report and Recommendation should be accepted and the action dismissed without issuance or service of process, without leave to amend, and without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court must conduct a de novo determination of any portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made; absent an objection, the court need only review for clear error before accepting the recommendation.
2. The court accepted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action without issuance or service of process, without leave to amend, and without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court."

"Accordingly, this action is DISMISSED without issuance or service of process, without leave to amend, and without prejudice."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought an action concerning claims that, according to the Report and Recommendation, challenged charges pending against him or his present incarceration at the Greenville County Detention Center. The magistrate judge concluded that Plaintiff failed to adequately plead a claim and that claims challenging the pending charges or incarceration were barred by the Younger abstention doctrine. Plaintiff filed objections but did not engage with or acknowledge that analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William S. Brown under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C. On December 15, 2025, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal without issuance and service of process and without leave to amend. Plaintiff filed objections on December 29, 2025, but did not address the magistrate judge's analysis. The district court accepted and incorporated the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)