

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order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)