

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

ASENCION VELA,	§	
	§	
Petitioner,	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. C-11-395
	§	
RICK THALER,	§	
	§	
Respondent.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION  
TO DENY PETITIONER’S MOTION  
TO ALTER OR AMEND FINAL JUDGMENT**


On May 21, 2012, United States Magistrate Judge Brian L. Owsley issued his “Memorandum and Recommendation to Deny Petitioner’s Motion to Alter or Amend Final Judgment” (D.E. 22). The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 22), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the

findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Petitioner's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment (D.E. 21) is **DENIED**.

ORDERED this 6th day of June, 2012.

  
NELVA GONZALES RAMOS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE