



on March 5, 2019. As a result, the Defendants Pharis, Walker, Egan, and Dr. Jones were dismissed from the lawsuit and the retaliation claims against Hoisington, Foust, and White were also dismissed.

On April 8, 2019, Curtis filed a motion for relief from judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). This motion focused on the manner in which judicial officers of the Court were assigned to the case and also complained that all of the defendants were required to be represented by one attorney. On May 10, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion for relief from judgment be denied. Curtis received a copy of this Report on May 17, 2019, but has filed no timely 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*).

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

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment (docket no. 39) is **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED June 23, 2019**.



---

Ron Clark, Senior District Judge