

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

REGINALD DARRELL TAYLOR,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:21-CV-0999-D
VS.	§	
	§	
EL CENTRO COLLEGE, et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION
AND ORDER

Plaintiff’s March 10, 2022 motion for leave & excusable negligence to file objections to magistrate judge’s order on alternative service of summons is denied, and the magistrate judge’s February 25, 2022 memorandum opinion and order is affirmed.

Because the magistrate judge’s memorandum opinion and order involves a nondispositive matter, plaintiff’s objections are governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), which provides, in pertinent part, that “[t]he district judge . . . must . . . modify or set aside any part of the [magistrate judge’s] order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Rule 72(a). “When a party appeals a magistrate judge’s order, he must demonstrate how the order is reversible under the applicable standard of review—*de novo* for error of law, clear error for fact findings, or abuse of discretion for discretionary matters.” *Jefferson-Pilot Life Ins. Co. v. Bellows*, 2003 WL 21501904, at *1 (N.D. Tex. June 24, 2003) (Fitzwater, J.). “The ‘clearly erroneous’ standard applies to the factual components of the magistrate judge’s decision.” *Lahr v. Fulbright & Jaworski, L.L.P.*, 164 F.R.D. 204, 208 (N.D. Tex. 1996) (Fitzwater, J.) (quoting *Smith v. Smith*, 154 F.R.D. 661, 665 (N.D. Tex. 1994) (Fitzwater, J.)). “The district court may not disturb a factual finding of the magistrate judge unless, although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court is left with the definite and firm

conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith*, 154 F.R.D. at 665) (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). “If a magistrate judge’s account of the evidence is plausible in light of the record viewed in its entirety, a district judge may not reverse it.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith*, 154 F.R.D. at 665) (internal quotation marks omitted). The legal conclusions of the magistrate judge are reviewed *de novo*, and the district judge “reverses if the magistrate judge erred in some respect in her legal conclusions.” *Id.* (citing *Smith*, 154 F.R.D. at 665). “[T]he abuse of discretion standard governs review of that vast area of . . . choice that remains to the [magistrate judge] who has properly applied the law to fact findings that are not clearly erroneous.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith*, 154 F.R.D. at 665) (alteration and ellipsis in original) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that he is entitled to relief and that the magistrate judge’s February 25, 2022 memorandum opinion and order should be reversed under the applicable standard of review. Accordingly, the memorandum opinion and order is

AFFIRMED.

March 21, 2022.


SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
SENIOR JUDGE