

After review of the pleadings, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the Defendants' motions to dismiss be denied. No objections to the Report were filed; 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. 30) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Defendants' motions to dismiss and amended motions to dismiss (docket no.'s 17, 18, 21, 26, and 27) are **DENIED**. It is further

ORDERED that the Defendant Pamela Pace having already filed an answer, the Defendants William Stephens and Brad Livingston shall have 30 days from the date of entry of this order in which to answer the lawsuit or otherwise plead. It is further

ORDERED that all of the deadlines in the Court's scheduling order (docket no. 14) shall commence to run as of the date of filing of the Defendants Stephens and Livingston's answer.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **22** day of **August, 2017**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge