

and concludes that the Motion should be denied for the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation [30].

To date, no objection to the Report and Recommendation has been filed by Plaintiff.¹ Where no party has objected to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, a court need not conduct a *de novo* review of it. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“[A] judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made.”). In such cases, the Court need only review the proposed findings of fact and recommendation and determine whether it is either clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

Having conducted the required review, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation thoroughly considered all issues and is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. The Court, being fully advised in the premises, finds that the Magistrate Judge properly recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction should be denied. The Report and Recommendation should be adopted as the opinion of this Court.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Report and Recommendation [30] of Magistrate Judge Robert H. Walker entered on November 14, 2013, is adopted as the finding of this Court.

¹ As of November 20, 2013, Plaintiff had signed for receipt of the Report and Recommendation [31].

IT IS, FURTHER, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [28] filed October 23, 2013, is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED, this the 30th day of December, 2013.

s/ Halil Suleyman Ozerden

HALIL SULEYMAN OZERDEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE