

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION

WOODROW WILSON WILLIAMS §
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:08cv150
LLOYD MASSEY, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Woodrow Williams, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the matter be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

Williams complained of a disciplinary case which he received in February of 2006. After review of the complaint, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report on September 5, 2008, recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed. The Magistrate Judge stated that Williams was well known to the Court, having filed at least three lawsuits or appeals which have been dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Consequently, the Magistrate Judge said, Williams has “three strikes” under 28 U.S.C. §1915(g), and so in order to proceed, he must either pay the full filing fee of \$350.00 or show that he is in imminent danger of serious bodily injury as of the filing of the lawsuit. Williams did neither of these, and so the Magistrate Judge recommended that the lawsuit should be dismissed.

Williams received a copy of the Report on September 8, 2008, but filed no 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 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, as well as the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has concluded that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action be and hereby is DISMISSED with prejudice as to the refiling of another *in forma pauperis* lawsuit raising the same claims as herein presented, but without prejudice to the refiling of the lawsuit without seeking *in forma pauperis* status and upon payment of the \$350.00 filing fee. Should Williams pay the full filing fee within 30 days after the entry of final judgment, the lawsuit shall proceed as though the full filing fee had been paid from the outset; however, payment of the full filing fee would not affect a frivolousness analysis. Finally, it is hereby

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

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 17 day of **October, 2008**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge