

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

JAMES RAY COOKSEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

AIDA VALLESTRO YANA COOKSEY,
et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:16-CV-67

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court referred this matter to United States Magistrate Judge Keith F. Giblin for consideration and recommended disposition of case-dispositive pretrial motions. On April 4, 2016, Judge Giblin issued a report and recommendation on the plaintiff’s request for a temporary restraining order. Judge Giblin recommended that the Court deny the request. The plaintiff has not objected to the magistrate judge’s recommendation, but he did file another motion for preliminary injunction [Doc. No. 20] alleging that the defendants have interfered with his property and “online banking.” *See Motion.*

Pursuant to the plaintiff’s renewed motion and in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court conducted a *de novo* review of the magistrate judge’s findings, the record, and the applicable law in this proceeding. After review, the Court finds that Judge Giblin’s findings and recommendations should be accepted. A review of the plaintiff’s additional motion for injunctive relief and the attached evidence also shows that his additional request should be denied for the same reasons stated in Judge Giblin’s report. Plaintiff has failed to meet the requirements for obtaining injunctive relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 and the governing legal standards,

discussed in detail in Judge Gibln's report. *See Report and Recommendation* [Doc. No. 11], at pp. 3-5.

The Court therefore **ORDERS** that the report and recommendation [Doc. No. 11] is **ADOPTED**. The court further **ORDERS** that the plaintiff's requests for a temporary restraining order [Doc. No. 7] and motion for preliminary injunction [Doc. No. 20] are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **13** day of **May, 2016**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge