

United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

HAO LIU	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 4:17-CV-874
v.	§	(Judge Mazzant/Judge Nowak)
	§	
CITY OF ALLEN, ET AL.	§	

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Came on for consideration the report of the United States Magistrate Judge in this action, this matter having been heretofore referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On March 12, 2018, the report of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. #7) was entered containing proposed findings of fact and recommendations that Plaintiff Hao Liu’s Motion for Leave to File New Cause (Dkt. #1) be denied. Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File New Cause was filed in accordance the Court’s pre-filing injunction imposed in the matter of Liu v. Medical Center of Plano, et al., 4:09-CV-625 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 26, 2010), requiring Plaintiff to obtain leave of court to file a lawsuit in this district. Since the entry of the Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff has filed “United States #4 Motion 60-Days Application Extending Time Service Due to Destruction, Depredation Government Property ‘Drake-Study’” (Dkt. #8), “United States #3 Motion Notice Obstruct Scheduled Service Process to Support Extending Time” (Dkt. #9), and “United States #5 Motion Executive Record Substitution Prosecution” (Dkt. #10). None of these filings contain specific objections, much less relate, to the Report and Recommendation. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, an objection to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation must be specific to the proposed findings and recommendations. Only objections that are sufficiently specific to focus the district court’s attention on the factual and legal issues in dispute should be considered.

Having received the report of the Magistrate Judge, and no objections thereto having been timely filed, the Court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and adopts the Magistrate Judge's report as the findings and conclusions of the Court.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File New Cause (Dkt. #1) is **DENIED**.

All relief not previously granted is hereby **DENIED**.

The Clerk is directed to **CLOSE** this civil action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 9th day of May, 2018.


AMOS L. MAZZANT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE