

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION

DOMINIC PIERRE ALEXANDER, 1<sup>ST</sup>,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 8:24-cv-01405-KKM-AEP

CHARLES R. WELLS,  
Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

In a November 6, 2024, report (Doc. 3), the United States Magistrate Judge recommends dismissal of pro se Plaintiff Dominic Alexander's complaint with prejudice, and denial of his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The deadline to object has passed without an objection.

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files a timely and specific objection to a finding of fact by a magistrate judge, the district court must conduct a de novo review of that factual issue. *Stokes v. Singletary*, 952 F.2d 1567, 1576 (11th Cir. 1992). The district court reviews legal conclusions de novo, even absent an objection. *See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); *Ashworth v. Glades Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm'rs*, 379 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1246 (M.D. Fla. 2019).

In the absence of any objection and after reviewing the factual allegations and legal conclusions, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation.

Alexander's complaint does not meet the requirements of Rule 8(a)(2), and his motion to proceed in forma pauperis is incomplete.

Accordingly, the following is **ORDERED**:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 3) is **ADOPTED** and made a part of this Order for all purposes.
2. Alexander's complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
3. The Clerk is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

**ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, on November 25, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathryn Kimball Mizelle  
United States District Judge