

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION**

Alejandro Luis Corominas v. Botie Hillhouse, et al.

Corominas · No. 6:25-cv-259-JDK · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge's report and recommendation in Alejandro Luis Corominas's pro se civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court dismissed the case without prejudice for failure to prosecute after the plaintiff failed to satisfy the filing fee requirement, amend his complaint, or file objections.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION ALEJANDRO LUIS COROMINAS, § #12100855, § § Plaintiff, § § v. § Case
No. 6:25-cv-259-JDK § BOTIE HILLHOUSE, et al., § § Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING
THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
Plaintiff Alejandro Luis Corominas, an inmate of the Henderson County Jail proceeding pro se,
filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 without paying the filing fee.

The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case. On October 27, 2025, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff's lawsuit be dismissed for failure to prosecute because Plaintiff had failed to comply with the Court's July 17 order to satisfy the filing fee requirement and to amend the complaint to cure identified deficiencies.

Docket No. 5. A copy of this Report was mailed to Plaintiff, who received it on November 3, 2025, but he did not file written objections or cure his deficiencies. Docket No. 6. This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Assn*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th

Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 5) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

All pending motions are DENIED as moot. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd_ day of December, 2025. JHREMYD. KERN DLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE