

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

HENRY CATO, Jr., #2214123,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-448-JDK-JDL
	§	
O. PEDRO, et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

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

Plaintiff Henry Cato, Jr., a prisoner of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love, for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.


On May 13, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendant’s motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s case as untimely (Docket No. 24) be denied. Docket No. 26. Defendant did not file timely objections.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days 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. *Dougllass 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 Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).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, Defendant did not object 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 the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 26) as the findings of this Court. Defendant’s motion (Docket No. 24) is **DENIED** without prejudice to Defendant’s ability to raise the potential untimeliness of Plaintiff’s lawsuit in a motion for summary judgment.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 1st day of **June, 2024**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE