

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

Aaron Fenwick v. Seaborne Virgin Islands, Inc. and Seastar Holdings, Inc.

Fenwick · No. 1:20-cv-0032 · Decided March 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The District Court of the Virgin Islands adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation following de novo review. The court dismissed Aaron Fenwick’s complaint without prejudice, ordered service of the dismissal order by certified mail, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of the Virgin Islands, Division of St. Croix
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert A. Molloy, Chief Judge
JURISDICTION	District Court of the Virgin Islands, Division of St. Croix
DECIDED	March 4, 2026
DOCKET	1:20-cv-0032
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation de novo and adopted the recommendation to dismiss the complaint without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should approve and adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after conducting de novo review.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. After conducting a de novo review and independently determining that no error occurred, the district court approved and adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation as the order of the court.
2. The complaint was dismissed without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The role of the magistrate judge is ‘to relieve courts of unnecessary work.’” (at footnote 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The document provides no substantive facts concerning the underlying employment-discrimination claims. The relevant procedural facts are that Plaintiff Aaron Fenwick filed the complaint on July 22, 2020, and the magistrate judge later recommended dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Emile A. Henderson III filed a Report and Recommendation on February 3, 2025, recommending dismissal of the complaint. After the reassignment of the case to Chief Judge Robert A. Molloy, the district court conducted an independent de novo review, found no error, approved and adopted the recommendation, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Hill v. Barnacle, 655 Fed. Appx. 142, 148 (3d Cir. 2016)
- Elmendorf Grafica, Inc. v. D.S. America, Inc., 48 F.3d 46, 49-50 (1st Cir. 1995)

OPINION

Fenwick

PER CURIAM.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

AARON FENWICK,)

) Plaintiff,)) Case No. 1:20-cv-0032 v.))

SEABORNE VIRGIN ISLANDS, INC. and)
SEASTAR HOLDINGS, INC.,)
) Defendants.)

ORDER1

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Emile A. Henderson III, filed on February 3, 2025, recommending dismissal of the complaint. (ECF No. 54.) The Court conducted a de novo review of the record and has made an independent determination finding no error.² Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 54, is APPROVED and ADOPTED as an Order of this Court as if fully set forth herein; it is further ORDERED that the Complaint filed on July 22, 2020, ECF No. 1, is DISMISSED without prejudice; it is further ORDERED that a copy of this Order shall be served on Aaron Fenwick at his last known address provided to the Court by certified mail return receipt requested and that a copy of the return receipt shall be filed on the docket; and it is further ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE that case. Dated: March 4, 2026

/s/ _____

ROBERT A. MOLLOY

Chief Judge 1 Due to the retirement of the judge previously assigned to this case, the undersigned, exercising his authority as Chief Judge of the District Court, reassigned this case to himself on February 17, 2026. 2 See *Hill v. Barnacle*, 655 Fed. Appx. 142, 148 (3d Cir. 2016) (opining that the district court is not required to make separate findings or conclusions when reviewing a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)) (citing *Elmendorf Grafica, Inc. v. D.S. America, Inc.*, 48 F.3d 46, 49-50 (1st Cir. 1995) (opining that "[28 U.S.C. § 636(b)] authorizes the district court to adopt in whole as well as in part the proposed findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge. Where, as here, the magistrate judge decided on an undisputed factual record, the district court was certainly not required to rehash the magistrate judge's reasoning. The role of the magistrate judge is 'to relieve courts of unnecessary work.'" (citations omitted).