

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION**

Roshan Pyarali Mansia v. Joseph B. Edlow

Civil Action No. 4:25-cv-03828 (S.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2026) · No. 4:25-cv-03828 · Decided February 26, 2026

OPINION

February 27, 2026 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION ROSHAN PYARALI § CIVIL ACTION NUMBER MANSIA, § 4:25-cv-03828 Plaintiff, § § § versus § JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE § § JOSEPH B. EDLOW, § Defendant. § ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION Plaintiff Roshan Pyarali Mansia filed this suit seeking to compel Defendant Joseph B. Edlow, Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, to issue a determination on his pending Forms I-918 and I-918A.

Dkt 1. Prior order on September 5, 2025, directed Plaintiff to serve Defendant within 90 days, or else risk “dismissal by the Court on its own initiative.” Dkt 5 at 1. Plaintiff failed to file proof of service. Later, on November 25, 2025, he was warned that failure to file proof of service by January 7, 2026, would result in dismissal of this action. Dkt 6.

No proof of service has been filed. Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Yvonne Y. Ho, recommending that this case be dismissed without prejudice lack of timely service. Dkt 7. The district court reviews de novo those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party has specifically objected. See FRCP 72(b)(3) & 28 USC § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989, per curiam).

The district court may accept any other portions to which there’s no objection if satisfied that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, en banc); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

None of the parties filed objections. No clear error otherwise appears upon review and consideration of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law. The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 7. This case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. A final judgment will issue by separate order.

SO ORDERED. Signed on February 26, 2026, at Houston, Texas. □□□ Honorable Charles Egkrige United States District Judge

