

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

**Bilal A. Al-Haqq v. Ms. Lucas, Ms. Pugh, Ms. Bostic, Mr. Thomas, Lt.
Fleming**

Al-Haqq · No. 2:24-cv-03960-DCC · Decided March 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts the magistrate judge’s recommendation in a civil-rights action brought by Bilal A. Al-Haqq. The court grants defendants’ motion for summary judgment and denies the plaintiff’s motions for a preliminary injunction and summary judgment after finding no clear error in the unobjected-to Report and Recommendation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Charleston Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Charleston Division
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-03960-DCC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation addressing the defendants' motion for summary judgment and the plaintiff's motions for summary judgment and a preliminary injunction. No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the Report for clear error on the face of the record rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order designated per curiam, with no published reporter citation appearing in the source.
PARTIES	Bilal A. Al-Haqq v. Ms. Lucas, Ms. Pugh, Ms. Bostic, Mr. Thomas, Lt. Fleming

TOPICS

summary judgment injunctions civil rights civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights civil procedure federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error when no party filed objections.
2. Whether to grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment.
3. Whether to grant Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.
4. Whether to grant Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need not conduct de novo review and may review the Report and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record.
2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment was granted.
3. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction was denied.
4. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a verified complaint alleging violations of his civil rights. The record before the court included cross-motions for summary judgment and Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction. The district court did not describe the underlying civil-rights allegations in detail in this order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a verified complaint alleging civil-rights violations. Defendants moved for summary judgment, and Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction and separately for summary judgment. The magistrate judge recommended granting Defendants' motion and denying Plaintiff's motions. With no objections filed, the district court reviewed the Report for clear error, found none, and adopted its recommendation.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION Bilal A. Al-Haqq,) Case No. 2:24-cv-03960-DCC) Plaintiff,)) v.)
ORDER) Ms. Lucas, Ms. Pugh, Ms. Bostic, Mr.) Thomas, Lt. Fleming,)) Defendants.)
_____) This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's verified
complaint alleging violations of his civil rights.

ECF No. 1, 12. 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 and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). April 4, 2025, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 30.

On April 9, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction. ECF No. 33. On May 1, 2025, Plaintiff filed his own motion for summary judgment and a response to Defendants' motion. ECF No. 35. Defendants filed responses in opposition to both motions. ECF Nos. 34, 36.

On January 28, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and recommended that Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted and that Plaintiff's motions be denied. ECF No. 40. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. No party has filed objections 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 (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. Co., 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.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Report’s recommendation. Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [30] is GRANTED, Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction [33] is DENIED, and Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment [35] is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr. United States District Judge March 13, 2026 Spartanburg, South Carolina