

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

WENDELL JAMES THORNTON,

Plaintiff,

V.

DALLAS ISD, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

NO. 13-CV-3012-P


**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On August 28, 2013, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (“FCR”) in which he recommended that the Court summarily dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The next day, the Magistrate Judge denied a motion for appointment of counsel. Plaintiff has filed no specific objection to the FCR. But, on September 11, 2013, Plaintiff filed a document that has been docketed as a Motion for Injunction and a Motion for Reconsideration (doc. 12). He therein states that he “is filing an injunction” and asks the Court to reconsider the denial of appointment of counsel.

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the issued FCR and the subsequent filing of Plaintiff, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3), the Court finds that the FCR is correct. Because Plaintiff has asserted no specific objection to the FCR and the Court cannot reasonably construe the subsequent filing of Plaintiff as stating any specific objection, the Court has reviewed the FCR for clear error and is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. The Court hereby accepts the FCR as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court. It further finds no legitimate basis for issuing an injunction or to reconsider the

denial of appointment of counsel. Accordingly, it **DENIES** the Motion for Injunction and Motion for Reconsideration (doc. 12). And it summarily **DISMISSES** this action with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

SO ORDERED this 6th day of January, 2014.



JORGE A. SOLIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE