

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

ARTAVIAS EDWARDS	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:16cv242
BRAD LIVINGSTON, ET AL.	§	

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

The Plaintiff Artavias Edwards, 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.

Edwards has filed three motions seeking a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, complaining that false disciplinary cases have been filed against him, his legal mail has been opened outside of his presence, he has been threatened and harassed, he was assaulted by an officer, the Office of the Inspector General refuses to conduct an investigation, he has been denied paper and envelopes for over three weeks, and he has been moved to a dangerous housing area.

After review of the pleadings, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Edwards' motions for injunctive relief be denied. A copy of this Report was sent to Edwards 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 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. 27) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Plaintiff’s motions for injunctive relief (docket no.’s 6, 21, and 26) are **DENIED**.

So Ordered and Signed

Jan 9, 2017



Ron Clark, United States District Judge