

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

<b>RICO CORTEZ DUKES</b>	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
v.	§	<b>Civil Case No. 3:17-CV-2507-D</b>
	§	
<b>JACOB ROTHSCHILD,</b>	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

**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, and this action is summarily dismissed with prejudice as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Plaintiff is warned that if he persists in filing frivolous or baseless actions, the court may impose monetary sanctions and/or bar him from bringing any further actions.

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

**SO ORDERED.**

November 27, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIDNEY A. FITZWATER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE