

After review of the pleadings, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed for want of subject matter jurisdiction. Dawson received a copy of the Report but has filed no objections; instead, he filed objections to the Court's order directing payment of the filing fee in installments through deductions from Dawson's inmate trust account. This order was authorized by 28 U.S.C. §1915(b)(1) and Dawson shows no valid basis for objecting to it.

Because Dawson did not file objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, 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. 11) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED** for want of jurisdiction. This dismissal is without prejudice to the Plaintiff's right to litigate his claims in a court of proper jurisdiction. It is further

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

So Ordered and Signed

Apr 26, 2018



Ron Clark, United States District Judge