

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

**Matthew Paul Scarborough v. Major Pressley, Sergeant Jackson, Lt.
Durant, Turberville Doctor, The Medical Staff, Turberville C.I.**

Scarborough · No. 4:25-cv-13653-RMG · Decided February 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and summarily dismissed claims against the Medical Staff, Turbeville Doctor, and Sergeant Jackson. The dismissals were without prejudice and without issuance and service of process because the complaint failed to state claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard Mark Gergel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
DECIDED	February 10, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-cv-13653-RMG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending summary dismissal without prejudice and without issuance and service of process of claims against the Medical Staff, Turbeville Doctor, and Sergeant Jackson in a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation to which specific objections are made, the district court conducts de novo review. In the absence of specific objections, the court reviews for clear error on the face of the record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional litigation

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when the plaintiff filed no specific objections.
2. Whether the complaint stated a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against a prison medical department or group, an insufficiently identified doctor, and Sergeant Jackson.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party fails to file specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and may accept the recommendation after satisfying itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.
2. A prison medical department or group of employees is not a person amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the complaint therefore failed to state a claim against the Medical Staff.
3. The complaint failed to state a claim against the Turbeville Doctor because the defendant was not sufficiently identified and the complaint contained no allegations supporting a claim against that defendant.
4. The complaint failed to state a claim against Sergeant Jackson because it made no allegations concerning him.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Where Plaintiff fails to file any specific objections, “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.”” (at 1)

“To state a claim for relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated; and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of law.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Matthew Paul Scarborough brought a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against prison-related defendants. The complaint named the prison medical staff as a group, identified a purported Turbeville Doctor without sufficient identification or supporting allegations, and made no allegations against Sergeant Jackson. The district court concluded that these pleading deficiencies failed to state a claim against the three defendants at issue.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of the claims against the Medical Staff, Turbeville Doctor, and Sergeant Jackson. Plaintiff filed no objections. The district court reviewed the recommendation, applied the applicable standard for unobjected-to recommendations, adopted the Report and Recommendation, and summarily dismissed those defendants without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Wilson v. S.C. Department of Corrections, No. 9:14-CV-4365-RMG, 2015 WL 1124701, at *1 (D.S.C. Mar. 12, 2015)
- Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983)
- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- Harden v. Green, 27 Fed. Appx. 173, 178 (4th Cir. 2001)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION Matthew Paul Scarborough, #396042, Case No. 4:25-cv-13653-RMG
Plaintiff, v. ORDER Major Pressley, Sergeant Jackson, Lt. Durant, Turbeville Doctor, The
Medical Staff, Turbeville C.I, Defendants. This matter is before the Court on the Report and
Recommendation (“R & R”) of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt.

No. 13), recommending this Court summarily dismiss Defendants “Medical Staff,” “Turbeville Doctor,” and Sergeant Jackson without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. For the following reasons, the Court adopts the R & R as the Order of the Court and dismisses the aforementioned Defendants from this matter.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court that has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976).

The Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R Plaintiff specifically objects. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Where Plaintiff fails to file any specific objections, “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.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins.

Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation omitted). “Moreover, 1 in the absence of specific objections to the R & R, the Court need not give any explanation for adopting the recommendation.” *Wilson v. S.C. Dept of Corr.*, No. 9:14-CV-4365-RMG, 2015 WL 1124701, at *1 (D.S.C. Mar. 12, 2015). See also *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir.1983).

Plaintiff has not filed objections. Upon a review of the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge comprehensively analyzed Plaintiff's claims to correctly determine dismissal of the aforementioned Defendants is warranted because Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a claim under § 1983 against them.

To state a claim for relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated; and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

The Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that Defendant “Medical Staff Tuberville” is entitled to dismissal because Plaintiff has failed to state a claim against it. Only persons may act under color of state law for purposes of 42 U.S.C § 1983.

Although suing an entire department may be a lawsuit against a group of people, groups of people are not amenable to suit under § 1983. See *Harden v. Green*, 27 Fed.Appx. 173, 178 (4th Cir. 2001) (finding that the medical department of a prison is not a person pursuant to § 1983).

The Magistrate Judge also correctly concluded that Defendant “Tuberville Doctor” is not a sufficiently identified Defendant and that even if properly identified, there are no allegations regarding this Defendant to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Finally, the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that Plaintiff has made no allegations as to Defendant Jackson and has therefore failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. 2 Consequently, the Court ADOPTS the R & R of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 13) as the order of the Court and SUMMARILY DISMISSES Plaintiff's claims against Defendants “Medical Staff,” “Turbeville Doctor,” and Jackson without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Richard Mark Gergel Richard Mark Gergel United States District Judge February 10, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 3