

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

**ROBERT MILLER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**ABRAHAM VEGA, ET AL.,**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Case No. 6:19-CV-305-JDK-JDL**

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Robert Miller, an inmate confined in the Texas prison system, proceeding *pro se*, filed the above-styled and numbered civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On July 12, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 9), recommending that the action be dismissed for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to the “three strikes” provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). A return receipt indicating delivery to Plaintiff was received by the Clerk on July 26, 2019 (Docket No.12).

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo* only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not file objections in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings

for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 9) as the findings of this Court.


Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report (Docket No. 9) be **ADOPTED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for purposes of *in forma pauperis* proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). It is further

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Docket No. 2) is **DENIED**. This Order does not bar refiling of this lawsuit without seeking *in forma pauperis* status and upon payment of the full \$400.00 filing fee. Plaintiff may resume the lawsuit if he pays the entire filing fee of \$400 within fifteen (15) days after the entry of the Final Judgment. It is finally

**ORDERED** that all motions not previously ruled on are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **15th** day of **August, 2019**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE