



remedy. The Texas state courts provide an adequate post-deprivation remedy through the tort of conversion. Thus, the Magistrate Judge concluded that Davis failed to show any basis for a claim under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

Davis received a copy of the Magistrate Judge 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*).

### **III. Conclusion**

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. 7) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for purposes of proceeding *in forma pauperis* as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The dismissal of this lawsuit is without prejudice to the Plaintiff’s right to seek such relief as he may be entitled in the courts of the State of Texas. It is further

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

**So Ordered and Signed**

Sep 20, 2017



---

Ron Clark, United States District Judge