

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------|
| CYNDI KING, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| VS. |) | |
| |) | 3:17-CV-2984-G (BK) |
| MAG. HORAN, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

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 summarily **DISMISSED** with prejudice as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Additionally, plaintiff is **WARNED** that if she persists in filing frivolous or baseless actions, the court may impose monetary sanctions and/or bar him from bringing any further action.

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 certification, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions and recommendation. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 and 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).^{*} In the event of an appeal, plaintiff 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.



A. JOE FISH
Senior United States District Judge

^{*} 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.