

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

Rodolfo Garcia v. Unknown Defendants

Garcia · No. 2:25-CV-00234 · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation after no party filed an objection. The court dismisses the plaintiff’s claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and denies as moot the motion for a preliminary injunction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00234
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending denial of a preliminary injunction and dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation, the district court reviews it for clear error or whether it is contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- injunctions
- civil procedure
- equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- equitable relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation?
2. Whether the district court should adopt the Memorandum and Recommendation, dismiss the plaintiff's claims without prejudice under Rule 41(b), and deny the preliminary-injunction motion as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine whether the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2. The court adopted the Memorandum and Recommendation in its entirety, dismissed the plaintiff's claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), and denied the motion for a preliminary injunction as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge’s M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff asserted claims against unknown defendants and moved for a preliminary injunction. The magistrate judge recommended denying the injunction and dismissing the claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The district court reviewed the record and found the recommendation neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Jason Libby issued a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending denial of Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction and dismissal of Plaintiff's claims without prejudice under Rule 41(b). After no timely objections were filed, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error or legal error, adopted it in its entirety, dismissed the claims without prejudice, and denied the preliminary-injunction motion as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)
- Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P., No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at *1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015)

OPINION

Garcia

PER CURIAM.

Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

January 13, 2026 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

RODOLFO GARCIA, §

Plaintiff,

V. CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00234

UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM & RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Jason Libby's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R"). (D.E. 11). The M&R recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction and dismiss Plaintiff's claims without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). /d. at 3. The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P.*, No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at *1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.) (citation omitted). Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court ADOPTS the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 11). Accordingly, the Court DISSMISSES without prejudice Plaintiff's claims, (D.E. 1), and DENIES as moot Plaintiff's 1/2 motion for a preliminary injunction. (D.E. 7). The Court will enter final judgment separately.

DA .M LES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Signed: Corpus Christi, Texas January y 2 2026 2/2