

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

Tyrone Maurice McBride v. Scotty Bodiford

McBride · No. 8:25-cv-13919-JDA · Decided January 23, 2026

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION Tyrone Maurice McBride,) Case No. 8:25-cv-13919-JDA)) Petitioner,)) v.) OPINION AND ORDER) Scotty Bodiford,)) Respondent.) Petitioner, proceeding pro se, seeks habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. [Doc. 1.]

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 William S. Brown for pre-trial proceedings. On December 19, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Petition be summarily dismissed because Petitioner failed to exhaust his state court remedies and because the Court should abstain from deciding the merits of the case under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971).

[Doc. 9 at 4–8.] 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 9.] Petitioner has filed no objections 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 and incorporates it by reference.

Accordingly, this action is summarily DISMISSED with prejudice, not on the merits, under Younger and for failure to exhaust state remedies. See *Nivens v. Gilchrist*, 444 F.3d 237, 247 (4th Cir. 2006); see also *Lui v. Comm’n on Adult Establishments of Del.*, 369 F.3d 319, 327 (3d Cir. 2004) (holding that “a Younger abstention stay requires a dismissal with prejudice of the federal suit”).

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 January 23, 2026 Greenville, South Carolina