

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

JIMMIE MARK PARROTT	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:15cv866
BRAD LIVINGSTON, ET AL.	§	

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND DENYING MOTIONS FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

The Plaintiff Jimmie Parrott, 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.

Parrott filed a motion for injunctive relief asking that the Court order he receive the medical treatment he desired and a separate motion asking for “administrative compliance,” which sought essentially the same relief. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motions be denied. Parrott received a copy of this Report but filed no objections thereto; 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. *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. 22) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Plaintiff’s motions for a preliminary injunction (docket no. 14) and motion to compel administrative compliance (docket no. 20) are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **23** day of **August, 2016**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge