

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
ALABAMA**

Ternecia Wilson v. Rose Gordon, et al.

Wilson · No. 1:25-CV-00792-BL-KFP · Decided April 30, 2026

OPINION

Wilson

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TERNECIA WILSON,)

) Plaintiff,))

v.) CASE NO. 1:25-CV-00792-BL-KFP

) ROSE GORDON, et al.,)) Defendants.)

ORDER

Plaintiff Ternecia Wilson, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed an Amended Complaint under 18 U.S.C. § 242, 34 U.S.C. § 12601, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. 9). On February 24, 2026, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the court dismiss the Plaintiff’s case prior to service of process for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and failure to follow a court order. (Doc. 12). The Plaintiff filed objections to the recommendation. (Doc. 13). A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district judge must “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”). A district court’s obligation to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made” requires a district judge to “give fresh consideration to those issues to which specific objection has been made by a party.” *United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 673, 675 (1980) (internal quotations and citations omitted) (emphasis in *Raddatz*). In her objections, the Plaintiff merely restates facts that the Magistrate Judge considered in her recommendation and fails to challenge a specific factual finding or legal conclusion of the Magistrate Judge. Because the Plaintiff failed to identify an error in the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings or legal conclusions, the court **OVERRULES** the Plaintiff’s objections, (doc. 13). After careful review of the file and upon consideration of the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court **ADOPTS** the

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and DISMISSES this action without prejudice prior to service of process for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and failure to follow a court order. The Court will enter a separate final judgment. DONE and ORDERED on this the 29th day of April, 2026. /

BILL LEWIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE