

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

Mark Anthony Augustus Taylor, Jr. v. Town of Spencer, et al.

Taylor v. Town of Spencer · No. 1:25-CV-581 · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s recommendation after reviewing the plaintiff’s generalized objections de novo. The court ordered that the requested summons not issue and dismissed all claims against the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts and Rowan County.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-CV-581
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's recommendation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The district court reviewed the recommendation de novo, adopted it, declined to issue the requested summons, and dismissed all claims against NCAOC and Rowan County.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the magistrate judge's conclusions challenged by objection; objections to proposed findings and recommendations must be specific.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Mark Anthony Augustus Taylor, Jr. v. Town of Spencer, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- section 1983
- municipal liability
- government liability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- municipal law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's generalized objection to the magistrate judge's recommendation was sufficiently specific under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation, decline to issue the requested summons, and dismiss the claims against NCAOC and Rowan County.

HOLDINGS

1. An objection to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations must be specific; a generalized objection that does not address the substance of the recommendation does not require detailed discussion.
2. The magistrate judge's conclusions were well reasoned and supported by law, and the court adopted the recommendation; all claims against NCAOC and Rowan County were dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Objections to proposed findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge must be specific.”

“Nowhere in the objections does the plaintiff address or engage with the substance of the Magistrate Judge’s reasoning, analysis, or discussion of relevant law.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff sought issuance of a summons and asserted claims against Rowan County and the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts. After a magistrate judge issued a recommendation, the plaintiff objected to the entirety of the recommendation but did not engage with its reasoning, analysis, or discussion of applicable law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A United States magistrate judge issued a recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The plaintiff filed a generalized objection purporting to challenge the entirety of the recommendation but did not address the magistrate judge's reasoning. The district court reviewed the conclusions de novo, adopted the recommendation, ordered that the requested summons not issue, and dismissed all claims against the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts and Rowan County.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 316 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Meris v. Settles, 1:18-CV-195, 2021 WL 11431786 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 16, 2020)

OPINION

TAYLOR

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

MARK ANTHONY AUGUSTUS)

TAYLOR, JR.,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) 1:25-CV-581) TOWN OF SPENCER, et al.,)) Defendants.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT

The Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge was filed in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and the Clerk served the recommendation on the parties. The plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommendation, purporting to object to the “entirety” of the recommendation. Doc. 22 at 5. Objections to proposed findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge must be specific. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 316 (4th Cir. 2005); *Meris v. Settles*, 1:18-CV-195, 2021 WL 11431786 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 16, 2020). Nowhere in the objections does the plaintiff address or engage with the substance of the Magistrate Judge’s reasoning, analysis, or discussion of relevant law. The plaintiff merely continues to assert that Rowan County and the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts are liable to him. Such generalized objections do not require detailed discussion. Out of an abundance of caution, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions de novo. Those conclusions are well-reasoned and supported by law, and the Court agrees. The Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation. It is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

1. The Clerk SHALL NOT issue the requested summons, Doc.10-1;
2. All claims against the defendants NCAOC and Rowan County in the first amended complaint are DISMISSED. This the 21st day of November, 2025. lakh Boe