

United States District Court
Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

December 19, 2017

David J. Bradley, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

BRANDON RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRAD LIVINGSTON, *et al*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:14-CV-464

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION
TO DENY DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**


On November 30, 2017, United States Magistrate Judge B. Janice Ellington issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation to Deny Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment” (D.E. 131). The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 131), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the

findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Motion for Summary Judgment (D.E. 117) is **DENIED**.

ORDERED this 18th day of December, 2017.


NELVA GONZÁLES RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE