

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas

**ENTERED**

February 05, 2024

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

JANE DOES 1–5,

Plaintiffs.

V.

WILLIE OBIANO,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:23-CV-00813

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S  
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

On October 31, 2023, all pretrial matters in this case were referred to United States Magistrate Judge Andrew M. Edison under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Dkt. 31. Judge Edison filed a Memorandum and Recommendation on January 17, 2024, recommending that Defendant’s Opposed Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Complaint (Dkt. 21) be **GRANTED**. Dkt. 34.

On January 23, 2024, Plaintiffs Jane Does 1–5 filed their Objections. Dkt. 36. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection [has been] made.” After conducting this de novo review, the Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Id.*; *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).


The Court has carefully considered the Objections; the Memorandum and Recommendation; the pleadings; and the record. The Court **ACCEPTS** Judge Edison’s

Memorandum and Recommendation and **ADOPTS** it as the opinion of the Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that:

- (1) Judge Edison's Memorandum and Recommendation (Dkt. 34) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** in its entirety as the holding of the Court;
- (2) Defendant's Opposed Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint (Dkt. 21) is **GRANTED**; and
- (3) Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. 35) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas on February 5, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE C. HANKS, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
JUDGE