

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

ROBERT BACK §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:16cv236  
TDCJ-CID, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

The Plaintiff Robert Back, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged deprivations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the matter 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.

Back filed a motion for injunctive relief asking that he be provided with proper medical bracing, including being taken to an outside clinic if necessary. He also asked to be taken into federal custody if the Court determined that was in his best interests.

After review of the pleadings, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Back's motion for injunctive relief be denied. Back 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 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 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. 12) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (docket no. 4) is **DENIED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's motion to incorporate additional facts into his request for injunctive relief (docket no. 5) is **GRANTED**.

**So Ordered and Signed**

Jan 25, 2017



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Clark, United States District Judge