

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

Devin Bailey v. Officer Christopher L. Lee; Greenville County

Bailey · No. 6:25-cv-06567-JDA-WSB · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopts the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after finding no clear error and no objections were filed. The court grants Greenville County’s motion to dismiss and denies Devin Bailey’s motion for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Greenville Division
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-06567-JDA-WSB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending that Greenville County's motion to dismiss be granted and Bailey's motion for summary judgment be denied. Because neither party filed objections, the district court reviewed the Report for clear error and adopted it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Devin Bailey v. Officer Christopher L. Lee, Greenville County

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- summary judgment
- civil procedure
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error when neither party filed objections.
2. Whether Greenville County's motion to dismiss should be granted.
3. Whether Bailey's motion for summary judgment should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and must only satisfy itself that no clear error appears on the face of the record.
2. Greenville County's motion to dismiss was granted.
3. Bailey'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” (Opinion and Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bailey brought an action against Greenville County and Officer Christopher L. Lee and later filed an Amended Complaint. Greenville County challenged the Amended Complaint by motion to dismiss, while Bailey sought summary judgment. The opinion does not independently recount the underlying substantive facts because it adopts the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after finding no clear error.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bailey filed an Amended Complaint against Greenville County and Officer Christopher L. Lee. Greenville County moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint, and Bailey moved for summary judgment. The magistrate judge recommended granting the County's motion and denying Bailey's motion. With no objections filed, the district court found no clear error, accepted and incorporated the Report and Recommendation, granted the County's motion to dismiss, and denied Bailey's motion for summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Bailey

PER CURIAM.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

GREENVILLE DIVISION

Devin Bailey,) Case No. 6:25-cv-06567-JDA-WSB) Plaintiff,))

v.) OPINION AND ORDER

) Officer Christopher L. Lee; Greenville) County,)) Defendants.) This matter is before the Court on Defendant Greenville County’s motion to dismiss and Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment. [Docs. 30; 39.] 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 January 16, 2026, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint against Defendants Greenville County and Christopher L. Lee. [Doc. 36.] On September 9, 2025, Greenville County filed a motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint.* [Doc. 30.] On January 20, 2026, Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment. [Doc. 39.] The motions are fully briefed and ripe for review. [Docs. 40; 41; 42.] On March 16, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Court grant Greenville County’s motion to dismiss and deny Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment. [Doc. 58.] The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the * Plaintiff had filed a proposed Amended Complaint on September 2, 2025. [Doc. 28.] serious consequences if they failed to do so. [Id. at 22.] The parties did not file 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, 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, Greenville County's motion to dismiss [Doc. 30] is GRANTED and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment [Doc. 39] is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge April 13, 2026 Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.