

UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 18-6772

OLANDIO RAY WORKMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN VANDERMOSTEN, Assistant Administrative Director, in individual and official capacity; ROY STRICKLAND, Commissary, in individual and official capacity; SERGEANT COUCH, in individual and official capacity; MR. BODIFORD, Deputy Director Greenville County Detention Center, in individual and official capacity; T. URICK, Officer, in individual and official capacity; MR. BUCHAN, Officer, in individual and official capacity; TRACY H. KREIN, Medical Administrator, in individual and official capacity; ZEQHARRE, 4993, in individual and official capacity; MALAONE, in individual and official capacity; JIMMY THOMPSON, in individual and official capacity; CPL NELMS, in individual and official capacity; C. LABORDE, in individual and official capacity; C. ANGELLO, in individual and official capacity; SMITH, in individual and official capacity; J. FRANCIS; BRAVO SHIFT,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL, in individual and official capacity; GREENVILLE COUNTY FOOD AND MAIL SERVICES, in individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (6:17-cv-00766-RBH)

Submitted: October 23, 2018

Decided: October 26, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Olandio Ray Workman, Appellant Pro Se. Russell W. Harter, Jr., CHAPMAN,
HARTER & HARTER, PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Olandio Ray Workman appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Workman that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Workman has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

FILED: October 26, 2018

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6772
(6:17-cv-00766-RBH)

OLANDIO RAY WORKMAN

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

JOHN VANDERMOSTEN, Assistant Administrative Director in individual and official capacity; ROY STRICKLAND, Commisary in individual and official capacity; SERGEANT COUCH, in individual and official capacity; MR. BODIFORD, Deputy Director Greenville County Detention Center in individual and official capacity; T. URICK, Officer in individual and official capacity; MR. BUCHAN, Officer in individual and official capacity; TRACY H. KREIN, Medical Administrator in individual and official capacity; ZEQHARRE, 4993 in individual and official capacity; MALAONE, in individual and official capacity; JIMMY THOMPSON, in individual and official capacity; CPL NELMS, in individual and official capacity; C. LABORDE, in individual and official capacity; C. ANGELLO, in individual and official capacity; SMITH, in individual and official capacity; J. FRANCIS; BRAVO SHIFT

Defendants - Appellees

and

GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL, in individual and official capacity;
GREENVILLE COUNTY FOOD AND MAIL SERVICES, in individual and official capacity

Defendants

J U D G M E N T

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 41.

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, CLERK

FILED: November 27, 2018

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6772
(6:17-cv-00766-RBH)

OLANDIO RAY WORKMAN

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

JOHN VANDERMOSTEN, Assistant Administrative Director in individual and official capacity; ROY STRICKLAND, Commisary in individual and official capacity; SERGEANT COUCH, in individual and official capacity; MR. BODIFORD, Deputy Director Greenville County Detention Center in individual and official capacity; T. URICK, Officer in individual and official capacity; MR. BUCHAN, Officer in individual and official capacity; TRACY H. KREIN, Medical Administrator in individual and official capacity; ZEQHARRE, 4993 in individual and official capacity; MALAONE, in individual and official capacity; JIMMY THOMPSON, in individual and official capacity; CPL NELMS, in individual and official capacity; C. LABORDE, in individual and official capacity; C. ANGELLO, in individual and official capacity; SMITH, in individual and official capacity; J. FRANCIS; BRAVO SHIFT

Defendants - Appellees

and

GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL, in individual and official capacity;
GREENVILLE COUNTY FOOD AND MAIL SERVICES, in individual and official capacity

Defendants

O R D E R

The court denies the petition for rehearing.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Niemeyer, Judge King, and Judge
Wynn.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

U.S. District Court

District of South Carolina
Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 6/13/2018 at 3:02 PM EDT and filed on 6/13/2018

Case Name: Workman v. Vandermosten et al

Case Number: 6:17-cv-00766-RBH

Filer:

Document Number: 111

Docket Text:

ORDER RULING ON REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION adopts [104] Report and Recommendation. The Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 63], GRANTS Defendants' motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 69], and DISMISSES this action with prejudice. Signed by Honorable R Bryan Harwell on 6/12/2018. (gpre,)

6:17-cv-00766-RBH Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Russell W Harter, Jr RWHjr@chhlaw.net, cbradley@chhlaw.net, cmharter@chhlaw.net, jgreene@chhlaw.net, psanders@chhlaw.net

Carly H Davis cmharter@chhlaw.net

6:17-cv-00766-RBH Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

Olandio Ray Workman
1263
Cell 19
Greenville County Detention Center
20 McGee Street
Greenville, SC 29601

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description: Main Document

Original filename: n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1091130295 [Date=6/13/2018] [FileNumber=8477795-0]
] [5c963df7238dbec46b9a26ec2b1704bbe03de6b1f5b6a298a6bedf11d4750ce93c1
feef6d96ff08996bada0cb90e695b21e6874dc2ec240472aebe3789f878d9]]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Olandio Ray Workman,)	Civil Action No.: 6:17-cv-00766-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
John Vandermosten, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). *See* ECF No. 104. The Magistrate Judge recommends denying Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment and granting Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. *Id.* at p. 11.

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 those portions of the R & R 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. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

No party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

¹ Plaintiff’s objections were originally due by May 4, 2018. *See* ECF Nos. 104 & 105. The Court granted Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to file objections and extended the deadline to May 22, 2018. *See* ECF No. 108. However, Plaintiff has not filed objections.

Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct 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’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having thoroughly reviewed the record, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 104]. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 63], **GRANTS** Defendants' motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 69], and **DISMISSES** this action *with prejudice*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
June 12, 2018

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Submitted: October 23, 2018

Decided: October 26, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Olandio Ray Workman, Appellant Pro Se. Russell W. Harter, Jr., CHAPMAN,
HARTER & HARTER, PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

STAY OF MANDATE UNDER
FED. R. APP. P. 41(d)(1)

Under Fed. R. App. P. 41(d)(1), the timely filing of a petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc or the timely filing of a motion to stay the mandate stays the mandate until the court has ruled on the petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc or motion to stay. In accordance with Rule 41(d)(1), the mandate is stayed pending further order of this court.

/s/Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Olandio Ray Workman,

Plaintiff,

v.

John Vandermosten, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 6:17-cv-00766-RBH-KFM

ORDER

Plaintiff Olandio Ray Workman, a pretrial detainee proceeding pro se, has filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against eighteen defendants. *See* ECF Nos. 1 & 57. The matter is before the Court for consideration of Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation ("R & R") of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, who recommends summarily dismissing Defendants Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services.¹ *See* ECF Nos. 18 & 22.

Standard of Review

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The Magistrate Judge's recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it 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).

¹ The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). The Magistrate Judge authorized partial service of process on the other defendants. *See* ECF No. 17.

The Court must engage in a de novo review of every portion of the Magistrate Judge’s report to which objections have been filed. *Id.* However, the Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the [C]ourt to a specific error in the [M]agistrate [Judge]’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of specific objections to the R & R, the Court reviews only for clear error, *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005), and the Court need not give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983).

Discussion²

Plaintiff is a pretrial detainee housed at the Greenville County Detention Center. He alleges various claims relating to his conditions of confinement at that jail. The Magistrate Judge recommends summarily dismissing Defendants Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services because they are not “persons” within the meaning of § 1983.³ R & R at p. 4. Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See* ECF No. 22.

I. Greenville County Council

Initially, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Greenville County Council is not a proper defendant for purposes of § 1983. The Greenville County Council is the governing body for Greenville County, consisting of individual council members who comprise the membership of the Council, none of whom have been individually named as party defendants in this case. *See Crouchman*

² The R & R summarizes the factual and procedural background of this case, as well as the applicable legal standards.

³ Under § 1983, “the party charged with the deprivation *must be a person* who may fairly be said to be a state actor.” *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 937 (1982) (emphasis added).

v. Pickens Cty. Council, No. CV 9:16-0804-CMC-BM, 2017 WL 767185, at *9 (D.S.C. Feb. 3, 2017), *adopted by*, 2017 WL 749393 (D.S.C. Feb. 27, 2017) (finding the Pickens County Council was not a proper § 1983 defendant and explaining a “group of people or use of such collective terms to name a § 1983 defendant has been found improper and inadequate” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Hodges v. Mayor & City Council of Annapolis*, 2016 WL 4140954, at *3 (D. Md. Aug. 3, 2016) (recognizing “a county council is not *sui juris*”). *See also Dunbar v. Metts*, No. CA 2:10-1775-HMH-BHH, 2011 WL 1480279, at *5 (D.S.C. Mar. 31, 2011), *adopted by*, 2011 WL 1480096 (D.S.C. Apr. 19, 2011) (“Lexington City Council is not a ‘person’ and is not responsible for the alleged violations of Plaintiff’s rights.”); *Smith-Berch, Inc. v. Baltimore Cty.*, 68 F. Supp. 2d 602, 626–27 & n.1 (D. Md. 1999) (finding the Baltimore County Council was not a “person” within the meaning of § 1983).

In his objections, Plaintiff indicates he is attempting to assert a municipal liability claim, as he cites *Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), and related cases. *See* ECF No. 22 at pp. 1–2. Under *Monell*, “municipalities and other local government units” (such as cities and counties) can be liable under § 1983 if an official policy or custom causes a deprivation of constitutional rights. *See* 436 U.S. at 690–91. However, to the extent Plaintiff has attempted to sue Greenville County, such a claim is foreclosed by the fact “that, under South Carolina law, it is the Sheriff of the County who is responsible for the operation of county detention centers, not the County.” *Crouchman*, 2017 WL 767185, at *9 (citing S.C. Code Ann. § 24–5–10). As such, the sheriff of Greenville County—not Greenville County or its individual county council members—is responsible for operating the Greenville County Detention Center.⁴ Plaintiff has made no allegations

⁴ Even if the Greenville County Sheriff had been appropriately named as a defendant, that office would be protected under Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity from being sued in federal court. *See generally Cromer v. Brown*, 88 F.3d 1315, 1332 (4th Cir. 1996).

calling into question the existence and applicability of this state law to his claims. *See Cobb v. South Carolina*, No. 2:13-CV-02370-RMG, 2014 WL 4220423, at *2, 7 (D.S.C. Aug. 25, 2014) (summarizing Fourth Circuit and South Carolina law holding that because the county has no control over the operations or policy of the jail, it cannot be held liable for events that take place there). Accordingly, the Court will dismiss Greenville County Council.

II. Greenville County Food and Mail Services

Like Greenville County Council, Greenville County Food and Mail Services is not a person within the meaning of § 1983. *See, e.g., Harden v. Green*, 27 F. App'x 173, 178 (4th Cir. 2001) ("The medical department of a prison may not be sued, because it is not a person within the meaning of § 1983."); *Nelson v. Lexington Cty. Det. Ctr.*, No. 8:10-CV-02988-JMC, 2011 WL 2066551, at *1 (D.S.C. May 26, 2011) ("Plaintiff has failed to establish that Food Service Supervisors, as a group of people and not individuals, are amenable to suit under § 1983."). Accordingly, the Court will dismiss Greenville County Food and Mail Services.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Court overrules Petitioner's objections, adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 18], and **DISMISSES** Defendants Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services *without prejudice and without issuance and service of process*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
October 23, 2017

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Olandio Ray Workman, #103852-1263,)	C/A: 6:17-766-RBH-KFM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u>
John Vandermosten,)	<u>FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY</u>
Roy Strickland,)	<u>DISMISSAL</u>
Sargent Couch,)	
Mr. Bodiford,)	
Greenville County Council, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The plaintiff, a pretrial detainee in the Greenville County Detention Center, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brings a civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 seeking monetary damages. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d)(D.S.C.), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in cases filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and submit findings and recommendations to the district court. The undersigned recommends that Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services be dismissed from the case.

BACKGROUND

The plaintiff alleges various violations of his constitutional rights concerning his treatment in the Greenville County Detention Center. He contends that he has been subjected to numerous unreasonable strip searches (doc. 1 at 15, 18). He alleges that he was not provided with a bed and was made to sleep on the floor (*id.* at 8, 14). The plaintiff asserts that the defendants have exhibited deliberate indifference to his safety because

they put him back in a cell with another prisoner after they informed him that the plaintiff “snitched” on him; the plaintiff contends that he has been threatened by the other prisoner (*id.* at 8, 12, 14, 15, 18). The plaintiff alleges that the defendants have been opening, reading, copying, and delaying his outgoing legal mail (*id.* at 8, 9, 14, 17). He asserts that the defendants have been deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs by refusing to examine his serious medical condition and improperly treating him (*id.* at 8, 9, 14, 16). The plaintiff contends that the Greenville County Council worked to deprive him of his constitutional rights and engaged in a conspiracy with the commissary (*id.* at 10, 19). He maintains that the food trays are not sanitized, the amount of food provided is insufficient, and that there is black mold at the detention center (*id.* at 12, 15, 19).

The plaintiff seeks \$66,633,733.18 in damages (*id.* at 20). He further requests that the federal government take control of the Greenville County Detention Center and have the Internal Revenue Service conduct an audit of the Greenville County Council and every administrative officer of the Greenville County Detention Center (*id.*).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the undersigned is authorized to review the complaint for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. The plaintiff filed this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the *in forma pauperis* statute. This statute authorizes the District Court to dismiss a case if it is satisfied that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted,” is “frivolous or malicious,” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Further, the

plaintiff is a prisoner under the definition in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(c) and “seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Thus, even if the plaintiff had prepaid the full filing fee, this court is charged with screening the plaintiff’s lawsuit to identify cognizable claims or to dismiss the complaint if (1) it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

As a *pro se* litigant, the plaintiff’s pleadings are accorded liberal construction and held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by attorneys. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (*per curiam*). However, even under this less stringent standard, a portion of the *pro se* pleading remains subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim cognizable in a federal district court. See *Weller v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990).

DISCUSSION

This complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n. 3 (1979)). A civil action under § 1983 “creates a private right of action to vindicate violations of ‘rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws’ of the United States.” *Rehberg v. Paulk*, 132 S.Ct. 1497, 1501 (2012). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1)

Appendix F

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 state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services cannot be sued under § 1983 because they are not persons.¹ It is well settled that only “persons” may act under color of state law, so a defendant in a § 1983 action must qualify as a “person.” Although suing an entire department may be a lawsuit against a group of people, groups of people are not amenable to suit under § 1983. *See Harden v. Green*, 27 F. App’x 173, 178 (4th Cir. 2001) (finding that the medical department of a prison is not a person pursuant to § 1983); *Nelson v. Lexington Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, C/A No. 8:10-2988-JMC, 2011 WL 2066551, at *1 (D.S.C. May 26, 2011) (finding that Food Service Supervisors was a group of people not subject to suit); *Dalton v. South Carolina Dep’t of Corr.*, C/A No. 8:09-260-CMC-BHH, 2009 WL 823931, at *2 (D.S.C. March 26, 2009) (dismissing the medical staff of SCDC and Prison Health Services as defendants because they were not persons). Therefore, Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services should be dismissed from this action because the plaintiff fails to state a § 1983 claim against them.

¹The plaintiff completed separate Forms-USM 285 for Greenville County Food Services and Greenville County Mail Services (doc. 14-1 at 16–17). To the extent that the plaintiff intended to name two separate entities as defendants, they should both be dismissed from this action for the reasons explained below.

Appendix F

RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, it is recommended that Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services be dismissed from this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal). This action remains pending against the remaining defendants at this time. **The petitioner's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.**

s/ Kevin F. McDonald
United States Magistrate Judge

May 16, 2017
Greenville, South Carolina

Appendix F

U.S. District Court

District of South Carolina
Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 5/16/2017 at 11:29 AM EDT and filed on 5/16/2017
Case Name: Workman v. Vandermosten et al
Case Number: 6:17-cv-00766-RBH-KFM
Filer:
Document Number: 18

Docket Text:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION recommending that Greenville County Council and Greenville County Food and Mail Services be dismissed from this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. This action remains pending against the remaining defendants at this time. Objections to R&R due by 5/30/17. Add an additional 3 days only if served by mail or otherwise allowed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6 or Fed. R. Crim. P. 45. Signed by Magistrate Judge Kevin McDonald on 5/16/17. (ctuc,)

6:17-cv-00766-RBH-KFM Notice has been electronically mailed to:

6:17-cv-00766-RBH-KFM Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

Olandio Ray Workman 1263
Cell 19
Greenville County Detention Center
20 McGee Street
Greenville, SC 29601

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description: Main Document

Original filename: n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1091130295 [Date=5/16/2017] [FileNumber=7849877-0]
] [c97d80e420ec3b96498623925dbf3b3280bc1a81757d86200faf5ce93ca65bc8f29
64609716aa395bb1caacb8429169230256c41c417bd84114c5f7ec027eb54]]

Imprisonment

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**