

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 ABILENE DIVISION

PATRICK H. WATSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
CHARLES SAMUELS, JR., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	Civil Action No. 1:15-CV-116-C

ORDER


On this day the Court considered the Amended Complaint filed by Patrick H. Watson, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, on June 10, 2015, together with Plaintiff’s Response to Court Order, filed January 13, 2017. On August 3, 2017, the United States Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation advising that Watson’s complaint be dismissed after screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b) and 1915(e)(2)(B). Watson’s complaint is subject to preliminary screening under these statutes because he is a prisoner seeking redress from an officer or employee of a governmental entity and because he is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. Watson did not file any objections to the Report and Recommendation and the time to do so has now expired.

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error and finds none. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the findings and conclusions in the Report and Recommendation are hereby **ADOPTED** as the findings and conclusions of the Court. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), and for the reasons stated in the thorough and well-reasoned Report and Recommendation, Watson’s claims for lack of medical or dental care

are **DISMISSED without prejudice** and the remainder of Watson’s claims are **DISMISSED with prejudice**. All relief not expressly granted by this Order is **DENIED**.

Pursuant to Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court finds that a certificate of appealability should be denied. For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, Watson has failed to show that a reasonable jurist would find (1) this Court’s “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong” or (2) “it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right” and “debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

SO ORDERED this 5th day of September 2017.



SAM R. CUMMINGS
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE