## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

## TYLER DIVISION

DODSON BALLARD	§	
v.	<b>§</b>	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:10cv174
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	<b>§</b>	
and		
DODSON BALLARD	§	
v.	<b>§</b>	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:10cv236
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	§	

## MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION

The Petitioner Dodson Ballard, proceeding *pro se*, filed these two habeas corpus applications under 28 U.S.C. §2254 complaining of the legality of his conviction. Both petitions challenge the same conviction and raise essentially the same grounds for relief. This Court ordered that the cases be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

The Petitioner Dodson Ballard has requested that the cases be consolidated. On June 27, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the two cases be consolidated into a single action, under cause no. 6:10cv174. The Magistrate Judge further recommended that Ballard only be charged one filing fee for this consolidated petition.

A copy of this Report was sent to Ballard at his last known address, return receipt requested, but no objections have been received; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district

judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. <u>Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association</u>, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the Report of the Magistrate Judge and has determined that this Report is correct. It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. 15) is ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil actions be and hereby are CONSOLIDATED for all purposes into one application for the writ of habeas corpus, styled as <u>Ballard v. Director, TDCJ-CID</u>, civil action no. 6:10cv174. *See* Rule 42(a), Fed. R. Civ. P. Any pleadings or documents received in either case shall be docketed in cause no. 6:10cv174; no further entries, after this order of consolidation, shall be made on the docket of cause no. 6:10cv236. It is further

ORDERED that, inasmuch as cause no. 6:10cv236 is wholly subsumed within cause no. 6:08cv182, a separate filing fee shall not be charged for cause no. 6:10cv236. This order of consolidation shall not affect the substantive rights of any party to this case. Finally, it is

ORDERED that any motions which may be pending in cause no. 6:10cv236 are hereby DENIED, without prejudice to their re-urging, if necessary, in cause no. 6:10cv174.

SIGNED this 21st day of July, 2010.

MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

had Uchnico