

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom; J., a minor v. Target Corporation

C/A No. 3:25-cv-12972-SAL · No. 3:25-cv-12972-SAL · Decided April 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action without prejudice, without leave for further amendment, and without issuance and service of process. The court found no clear error and noted that the case was duplicative of another action; a pending motion for a preliminary injunction was terminated.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherri A. Lydon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	April 10, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-12972-SAL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation, dismissed the action, and terminated the pending motion for a preliminary injunction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error. Specific objections require de novo review of the challenged portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, J., a minor v. Target Corporation

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

injunctions

pleadings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation?
2. Whether the Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal should be adopted where the plaintiff failed to bring the action into proper form and the action was duplicative of an earlier dismissed action.
3. Whether the pending motion for a preliminary injunction should remain pending after dismissal of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not provide an explanation for adopting it and must satisfy itself that no clear error appears on the face of the record.
2. The Report and Recommendation was adopted, and the action was dismissed without prejudice, without leave for further amendment, and without issuance and service of process.
3. The motion for a preliminary injunction was terminated in light of the dismissal of the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.""

"this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, WITHOUT LEAVE FOR FURTHER AMENDMENT, AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, proceeding pro se, filed a civil action against Target Corporation. The magistrate judge determined that Plaintiff had failed to bring the case into proper form and that the action duplicated Ubokudom v. Target, C/A No. 3:25-3429-SAL, which had been dismissed in September 2025. Plaintiff did not object to the Report and Recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil action against Target Corporation. Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett recommended dismissal because Plaintiff failed to bring the case into proper form and because the action duplicated another action that had been dismissed in September 2025. Plaintiff did not object to the Report and Recommendation. The district court found no clear error, adopted the Report, dismissed the case without prejudice and without

leave for further amendment or issuance and service of process, and terminated the preliminary-injunction motion.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

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)
- Ubokudom v. Target, C/A No. 3:25-3429-SAL

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA Ubong Christopher Ubokudom; J., a minor, C/A No.: 3:25-cv-12972-SAL Plaintiffs, v. ORDER Target Corporation, Defendant. Plaintiff Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action. This matter is before the court on the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), recommending the court dismiss this action without prejudice.

[ECF No. 22.] As explained in the Report, Plaintiff has failed to bring this case into proper form, and this action is also subject to dismissal because it is duplicative of another action, Ubokudom v. Target, C/A No. 3:25-3429-SAL, which was dismissed in September 2025. Id. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report.

Id. at 5. Plaintiff has not objected to the Report, and the time to do so has expired. The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976).

The court is charged with making a de novo determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and 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 & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Finding no clear error in the Report, ECF No. 22, it is adopted and incorporated. For the reasons discussed in the Report, this case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, WITHOUT LEAVE FOR FURTHER AMENDMENT, AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, ECF No. 6, is TERMINATED in light of the dismissal of this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Sherr tk. April 9, 2026 Sherri A. ee Columbia, South Carolina United States District Judge