

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

Phillip Reeves v. Michael Callison; Hobart Lewis

Reeves · No. 6:25-cv-13834-CMC · Decided March 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The court adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismisses Phillip Reeves’s complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Because Reeves filed no objections, the court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and found none.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION Phillip Reeves, Civil Action No. 6:25-cv-13834-CMC Plaintiff, vs. ORDER Michael Callison; Hobart Lewis, Defendants. This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Complaint filed December 12, 2025. Dkt. No. 1.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings. On February 9, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending this matter be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Dkt. No. 10. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff failed to file objections, and the time to do so has expired.

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 is required to 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 a review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error, and agrees this matter should be dismissed. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report by reference in this Order. This matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/Cameron McGowan Currie CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE Senior United States District Judge Columbia, South Carolina March 12, 2026 2