

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA**

**Marcus Mandrell Williams v. Ms. Favor, Tyria Frazier, Kinard
Gordon, and Pamela Smith**

No. 0:25-14011-MGL-PJG, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina (April 23, 2026)

OPINION

Favor

PER CURIAM.

Ss

OF SOUTHEY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ROCK HILL DIVISION

MARCUS MANDRELL WILLIAMS, §

Plaintiff, vs. Civil Action No. 0:25-14011-MGL-PJG

MS. FAVOR, TYRIA FRAZIER, KINARD

GORDON, and PAMELA SMITH, §

Defendants.

"ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT IN PART

Plaintiff Marcus Williams filed this lawsuit pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging jail personnel violated his constitutional rights by denying him medical care while he was detained and awaiting trial. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (the Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court Williams's complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as to Defendants Frazier, Gordon, and Smith. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on March 16, 2026. To date, Williams has failed to file any objections. "[I]n 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.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. It is the judgment of the Court Williams’s complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE and without issuance of process as to his claims against Defendants Frazier, Gordon, and Smith. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed this 23rd day of April 2026, in Columbia, South Carolina. s/ Mary Geiger Lewis

MARY GEIGER LEWIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Williams is hereby notified of his right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.