



itself that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir 1996); see also FRCP 72(b) Advisory Comm Note (1983).

The Court has reviewed *de novo* the objection made by Plaintiffs. The objection lacks merit. Disposition of the issue is clearly controlled by authority cited in the Memorandum and Recommendation. For example, see 28 USC §§ 1441(b), 1446(b)(2)(A); Tex Rule Civ Proc 106(a)(2); *Hollister v Palmer Independent School District*, 958 SW2d 956, 959 (Tex App—Waco 1998, no pet). The Court has otherwise considered the Memorandum and Recommendation and reviewed the pleadings, the record, the applicable law, and the response. No clear error appears.

The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 24.

The motion to remand by Plaintiffs Erin McCain-Townley and Marc A. Townley is DENIED. Dkt 8.

SO ORDERED.

Signed on January 7, 2021, at Houston, Texas.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ch R Eskridge" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Hon. Charles Eskridge  
United States District Judge