# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT <br> NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS <br> DALLAS DIVISION 

JOSE T. RODRIGUEZ, \#1243502, §
Plaintiffs, §
v. §

DR. NORVEL L. ARNOLD, et al., § Defendants. §

Civil Case 3:17-CV-1469-B-BK § §

## ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions and a recommendation in this case. No objections were filed. The District Court reviewed the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court ACCEPTS the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution. See FED. R. CIV. P. 41 (b).

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. Howard v. King, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th

Cir. 1983). ${ }^{1}$
SO ORDERED this $30^{\text {th }}$ day of August, 2017.


[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court certifies an appeal as not taken in good faith.

