

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| SHELLEY SONIAT | § | |
| | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| vs. | § | CASE NO. 4:14cv77 |
| | § | (consolidated with 4:14cv122 and 4:14cv131) |
| EDWARD JACKSON, III, et al. | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |

**MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND
ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Came on for consideration the report of the United States Magistrate Judge in this action, this matter having been heretofore referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On December 9, 2014, the report of the Magistrate Judge was entered containing proposed findings of fact and recommendations that the federal claims in Plaintiff's consolidated action (4:14cv77, consolidated with 4:14cv122 and 4:14cv131) be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim, that any remaining state law claims be dismissed for want of jurisdiction, and that this matter be closed on the court's docket.

Although *pro se* Plaintiff did not timely file any objections to the report in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C),¹ the court notes that Plaintiff has filed several motions for reconsideration (*see* Dkts. 45 & 47) and other pleadings attempting to set forth the grounds for jurisdiction here (*see*

¹The Magistrate Judge twice advised her of her right to do so. *See* Dkts. 33 and 36.

Dkts. 39, 41, 43 & 46). The court has made a *de novo* review of the materials filed by Plaintiff and is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and any objections by Plaintiff are without merit as to the ultimate findings of the Magistrate Judge. As to Plaintiff's subsequent attempts to amend her complaint (*see* Dkts. 38, 37 & 40), in his report and recommendation, the Magistrate Judge found that no amendment to the written pleadings would sufficiently state any claims over which the court has jurisdiction (*see* Dkt. 33 at 3). The court agrees. The court hereby adopts the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge as the findings and conclusions of this court. Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration (Dkts. 45 & 47) are DENIED.

Therefore, the federal claims in Plaintiff's consolidated action (4:14cv77, consolidated with 4:14cv122 and 4:14cv131) are dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim, any remaining state law claims are dismissed for want of jurisdiction, and all three cases shall be closed on the court's docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this the 31st day of March, 2015.



RICHARD A. SCHELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE