

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Robert Ryan Delgadillo v. Lieutenant Hall

Delgadillo v. Hall · No. 8:25-cv-13504-BHH · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and transferred Robert Ryan Delgadillo’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against a corrections officer to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. The court found no clear error after Plaintiff filed no objections and instead supported the transfer.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bruce H. Hendricks
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	8:25-cv-13504-BHH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action in the District of South Carolina. After referral to a magistrate judge for preliminary review, the district court reviewed and adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation to transfer the action to the Middle District of Alabama.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court reviews the record and recommendation for clear error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Robert Ryan Delgadillo v. Lieutenant Hall

TOPICS

- venue
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to transfer the § 1983 action to the Middle District of Alabama.
2. What standard of review applies when no specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

HOLDINGS

1. When no specific objections are filed, the district court reviews the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and the record for clear error.
2. The action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error.” (2)

“Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 8), and the Court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint against Lieutenant Hall, a corrections officer employed in Elmore, Alabama. The claims arose from events occurring in Alabama, and Plaintiff ultimately asked the court to transfer the action to the Middle District of Alabama.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended transfer because the defendant is a corrections officer employed in Elmore, Alabama, and the events underlying the complaint occurred there. Plaintiff did not file objections and instead supported transfer. The district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, found none, adopted the Report, and transferred the action to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976)

OPINION

Delgadillo

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert Ryan Delgadillo,)) Plaintiff,)) Civil Action No. 8:25-cv-13504-BHH v.)

) ORDER

Lieutenant Hall,)) Defendant.) _____) This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Robert Ryan Deladillo's ("Plaintiff") complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review. On November 24, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report"), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court transfer this case to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama because Plaintiff brings this action against a corrections officer employed in Elmore, Alabama, arising out of events that occurred there. (ECF No. 8.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report and instead filed a response in support, asking the Court to please transfer the case to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. (ECF No. 10.) The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 8), and the Court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States District Judge January 6, 2026 Charleston, South Carolina 2