Warfield v. Livingston Doc. 22

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

MARK ADRIAN WARFIELD §

v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:14ev542

BRAD LIVINGSTON, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Mark Warfield, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the case 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.

Warfield filed a motion asking that his lawsuit be dismissed. The magistrate judge issued a report recommending that this motion be granted and the lawsuit dismissed without prejudice. No objections were filed to this Report; accordingly, the parties are 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 proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 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. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the report of the magistrate judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a magistrate judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.") It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. 21) is hereby **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action be and hereby is DISMISSED WITHOUT

PREJUDICE on the motion of the Plaintiff. It is further

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 12th day of February, 2015.

MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE