

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Jonathan Kendrel Johnson v. Sgt. Lenored Longe, Sgt. J. Coleman,
Sgt. Gentry, Jeffery Stevens

Johnson v. Longe · No. 4:25-cv-09753-JD-TER · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning the screening of a pro se prisoner’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. The court dismissed claims against Sgt. Lenored Longe and Jeffery Stevens with prejudice for lack of personal involvement or sufficient supervisory-liability allegations, while allowing claims against Sgt. J. Coleman and Sgt. Gentry to proceed. The order was entered on December 10, 2025, and provides notice of the right to appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Joseph Dawson, III
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	4:25-cv-09753-JD-TER
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation following statutory screening of a pro se prisoner's amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. No objections were filed. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation, dismissed claims against Longe and Stevens with prejudice and without service, and allowed claims against Coleman and Gentry to proceed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, the district court reviewed the record for clear error and otherwise accepted the recommendation without a de novo explanation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Jonathan Kendrel Johnson v. Sgt. Lenored Longe, Sgt. J. Coleman, Sgt. Gentry, Jeffery Stevens

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights due process civil procedure standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law prisoner litigation federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in the absence of objections.
2. Whether Johnson stated a viable § 1983 claim against Longe when he alleged no affirmative causal connection between Longe's personal conduct and the alleged constitutional injuries.
3. Whether Johnson stated a viable § 1983 claim against Stevens based solely on Stevens's supervisory role without allegations of personal involvement or a legally sufficient basis for supervisory liability.
4. Whether Johnson's allegations against Coleman and Gentry were sufficient at the screening stage to avoid summary dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need only determine whether the record contains clear error before adopting the recommendation.
2. A § 1983 claim requires an affirmative causal connection between the defendant's personal conduct and the alleged constitutional deprivation; Johnson failed to state such a claim against Longe.
3. A plaintiff may not establish § 1983 liability against a supervisor through a bare allegation of supervisory responsibility without facts showing personal involvement or satisfying the requirements for supervisory liability.
4. At the preliminary screening stage, Johnson's allegations against Coleman and Gentry, liberally construed, were sufficient to proceed beyond summary dismissal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Johnson, a pro se pretrial detainee proceeding in forma pauperis, alleged that Coleman directed others to remove his clothing, shoes, blankets, and mattress, leaving him to sleep on concrete and steel and causing injuries to his neck, back, and sciatic nerve. He alleged that Gentry found him guilty without a hearing and imposed a thirty-day sanction, and that he received only Tylenol rather than meaningful medical care. Johnson alleged that Longe merely placed him in a housing unit and that Stevens was liable based only on supervisory status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Johnson filed an amended complaint alleging constitutional violations arising from the removal of his clothing, bedding, and mattress, disciplinary proceedings, and inadequate medical care. Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III conducted screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A, recommended dismissal of Longe and Stevens, and authorized service on Coleman and Gentry. After no objections were filed, the district court reviewed the record for clear error and adopted the recommendation in full.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Short v. Hartman, 87 F.4th 593, 609 (4th Cir. 2023)
- Kentucky v. Graham, 473 U.S. 159, 166 (1985)
- Vinnedge v. Gibbs, 550 F.2d 926, 928 (4th Cir. 1977)
- Shaw v. Stroud, 13 F.3d 791, 799 (4th Cir. 1994)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978)
- Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)