

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

MICHAEL A. BROWN, #617435,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	3:14-CV-2380-D
	§	
CRAIG WATKINS, District Attorney, et al.	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER

After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge, the court concludes that the findings and conclusions are correct. It is therefore ordered that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge are adopted.


It is therefore ordered that this action is summarily dismissed with prejudice as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b). This dismissal counts as a “strike” or “prior occasion” within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

The court prospectively certifies that any appeal of this action would not be taken in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). In support of this finding, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the magistrate judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendation. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 n.21 (5th Cir. 1997). Based on the findings and recommendation, the court finds that any appeal of this action would present no legal point of arguable merit and would, therefore, be frivolous. *See Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983).

If plaintiff appeals this dismissal, he may challenge this certification by filing a separate motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal with the clerk of the court, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202; Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5).

SO ORDERED.

October 30, 2014.



SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
CHIEF JUDGE