

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

ADAM STREGE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES SCHWAB, et al.,

Defendants.

§
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §

Civil Action No. **3:24-CV-667-L-BK**

ORDER

On April 4, 2024, the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (“Report”) (Doc. 11) was entered, recommending that the court dismiss with prejudice this action by *pro se* Plaintiff Adam Strege against eighteen Defendants as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The Report further recommends that Plaintiff should not be granted leave to amend his pleadings because, even “[b]ased on the most deferential review of his complaint, it is highly unlikely that, given the opportunity, [he] could allege cogent and viable legal claims.” Report 3. Thus, the Report “concludes that granting leave to amend under these circumstances would be futile and cause needless delay.” *Id.* Finally, the Report recommends that the court warn Plaintiff, who “has an extensive and abusive filing history in federal courts nationwide,” that he may be sanctioned monetarily and barred from bringing any further actions if he persists in filing frivolous lawsuits and asserting baseless claims. *Id.* at 3-4.

On April 23, 2024, Plaintiff filed ninety page of objections to the Report* that are equally baseless and amount to nothing more than undecipherable gibberish. For example, Plaintiff asserts

* He also appears to object to the magistrate judge’s electronic order (Doc. 12) terminating his “Motion Electronically File” (Doc. 5), filed March 12, 2024, in which he moves the court “to allow [him] to electronically file court documents with Pacer,” which he asserts “only works if the Federal Court Clerk emails the Pacer link to Open[.]” His objections

over and over again that “God Loves the Computer Julie 1 will help Satan Launch Nuclear Missile to Kill all Earth People God Loves the Computer Julie 1 will help God hates us Laun[c]h Nuclear Missiles God Loves us.” Obj. 1. Similarly nonsensical phrases are repeated throughout his entire objections with no breaks in between. The court **overrules** these frivolous objections.


Having considered the pleadings, file, record in this case, and Report, and having conducted a de novo review of that portion of the Report to which objection was made, the court determines that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, and **accepts** them as those of the court. Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the court **dismisses with prejudice** this action as frivolous against all Defendants. Given Plaintiff’s decision to file frivolous objections to the Report instead of using his objections as an opportunity to explain why he should be given an opportunity to amend his pleadings, the court agrees with the magistrate judge that he should not be allowed to amend his pleadings. *Further, if Plaintiff persists in filing frivolous lawsuits and asserting baseless claims in this district, he will be sanctioned monetarily, barred from bringing any new actions in the future, or subjected to other sanctions the court deems appropriate.*

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 **accepts and incorporates** by reference the Report. See *Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 and n.21 (5th Cir. 1997). Based on the Report, 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). 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

to this order are denied as moot in light of the court’s determination that this action should be dismissed as frivolous as recommended by the Report.

the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202; Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5).

It is so ordered this 26th day of April, 2024.


Sam A. Lindsay
United States District Judge