

---

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

---

WILLIAM A. JENSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

I.R.S., COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY  
DEPT HUD 1A, HOWARD, LEWIS &  
PETERSON, P.C., PARSONS, BEHLE &  
LATIMER, JODY HOWE, and AXIOM  
FINANCIAL,

Defendants.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

Case No. 2:16-CV-357

Judge Clark Waddoups

---

This case was assigned to United States District Court Judge Clark Waddoups, who then referred it to United States Magistrate Dustin Pead pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). (*See* Dkt. No. 6.) On February 2, 2017, Judge Pead issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the court dismiss this case for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). (Dkt. No. 52.) Plaintiff timely filed an Objection consisting of handwritten miscellanea, a list of complaints about Frank Naylor IV, a number of documents similar to those previously filed on multiple occasions with the court, references to state court cases against other defendants, correspondence from the Department of the Navy addressed to a non-named party or person, references to an alleged class action lawsuit, plaintiff's health issues and an I.R.S. tax lien, cancelled checks, and check reconciliation reports from December 1998 through approximately August of 2001. (Dkt. No. 53). After the objections deadline passed, plaintiff also filed additional correspondence, including an oversized brown hardbound book about the Civil War alleged to have been damaged in a storage unit and

documents stating complaints against additional defendants such as Cottonwood Insurance and Bill Pizza. (Dkt. Nos. 54-59.)

Upon a *de novo* review of Judge Pead's findings, the court agrees with Judge Pead that neither the Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 23) nor plaintiff's subsequent amendments, correspondence, and/or objection contain any identifiable causes of action or legally cognizable theories that would enable the court to identify a claim upon which relief can be granted. No errors in Judge Pead's analysis were recognizable in plaintiff's objection. Accordingly, the court APPROVES AND ADOPTS Judge Pead's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 52) in its entirety. This case is therefore dismissed.

SO ORDERED this 28th day of March, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

  
Clark Waddoups  
United States District Judge