

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Jerry C. Edwards, #148811, a/k/a Jerry Cecil)
Edwards, #395338,)

Case No.: 9:19-cv-03114-JD-MHC

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

OPINION & ORDER

Kathy White, Nurse’s Supervisor; Ms.)
McAdams, Mental Health Supervisor; Josh)
Gillespie, Classification Supervisor; Sheriff)
Chuck Wright,)

Defendants.)

This matter is before the Court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Molly H. Cherry (“Report and Recommendation”), made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) of the District of South Carolina.¹ Jerry C. Edwards, #148811, a/k/a Jerry Cecil Edwards, #395338, (“Edwards” or “Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, seeks damages based on alleged civil rights violations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 while a pretrial detainee at the Spartanburg County Detention Center (“SCDC”).

Edwards filed a Complaint against Kathy White, Nurse’s Supervisor (“White”); Ms. McAdams, Mental Health Supervisor (“McAdams”); Josh Gillespie, Classification Supervisor (“Gillespie”); and Sheriff Chuck Wright (“Wright”) (collectively “Defendants”) on November 1, 2019, specifically challenging his conditions of confinement and alleging that Defendants were

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

deliberately indifferent to his medical needs. (DE 1.) Plaintiff's Complaint seeks actual and punitive damages, totaling \$1.2 million dollars, and he seeks a change to SCDC's policies regarding how it operates its medical and mental health services and the number of inmates the facility allows in a cell. (DE 1.) On June 6, 2021, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending *inter alia* that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment be granted because Plaintiff has not shown a constitutional deprivation and the Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity.

The Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court 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).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation (DE 68) and incorporates it herein.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (DE 46) is granted and Plaintiff's claims are dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Joseph Dawson, III
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
July 21, 2021

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.