



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

DUSTIN ROBERT WILLIAMSON,	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 0:15-4755-MGL
	§	
BRIAN STERLING, and/or Jane or John Doe,	§	
SCDC; DELORIS CHARLTON, Administrator,	§	
Barnwell County Detention Center; ED	§	
CARROLL, Sheriff; individually and in their	§	
official capacities; DAVID MILLER, Deputy	§	
Solicitor; and JACK HAMOCK, Solicitor; in	§	
their individual capacities,	§	
Defendants.	§	

---



---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,  
GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,  
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION,  
AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND**

---



---

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for (1) review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Defendants' motions for summary judgment be granted and Plaintiff's motion for an injunction be denied, and (2) consideration of Plaintiff's motion to amend. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on March 21, 2017, and the Clerk of Court entered Plaintiff's objections to the Report, which includes his motion to amend, on April 5, 2017.

Plaintiff has submitted to the Court twenty-nine objections to the Report. But the objections generally fall into two categories: (1) Plaintiff's recitation of arguments the Magistrate Judge has already considered and rejected and, (2) Plaintiff's conclusory allegations of wrongdoing. As to the former, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's treatment of those issues and need not set forth another discussion here. And regarding the latter, Plaintiff's complaints are so lacking in merit as not to justify any analysis. *See United States v. Patel*, 879 F.2d 292, 295 (7th Cir. 1989) ("When issues patently lack merit, the reviewing court is not obliged to devote scarce judicial resources to a written discussion of them.").

In Plaintiff's objections, he asks to amend his complaint within ten days of the filing of this Order so, the Court assumes, he can provide the names of the Jane and Joe Does he alleges were personally involved in violating certain of this constitutional rights. The Court will grant the motion.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court overrules the objections, adopts the Report, and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of this Court Defendants' motions for summary judgment are **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's motion for an injunction is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint within ten days of the filing of this Order is **GRANTED** so he can provide the names of the Jane and Joe Does who were allegedly personally involved in violating certain of his constitutional rights.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 10th day of April, 2017, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.