

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

Roel L. v. Leland Dudek

Roel L. · No. 2:25-CV-00083 · Decided March 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation in a Social Security action. The court denies Roel L.’s construed motion for summary judgment, grants the Commissioner’s construed motion, and dismisses the action after finding no clear error and receiving no timely objections.

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	March 6, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00083
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation in a Social Security action. The plaintiff and Commissioner had filed construed cross-motions for summary judgment; no timely objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error before accepting the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not specified.
PARTIES	Roel L. v. Leland Dudek

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should accept the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation when no timely objection was filed and the record disclosed no clear error.
2. Whether the parties' construed cross-motions for summary judgment should be resolved in favor of the Commissioner and the action dismissed.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The plaintiff's construed motion for summary judgment was denied, the Commissioner's construed motion for summary judgment was granted, and the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"When no timely objection to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation." (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roel L. brought an action seeking review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security. The parties filed construed cross-motions for summary judgment, and the magistrate judge recommended granting the Commissioner's motion and dismissing the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton recommended denying Roel's construed motion for summary judgment, granting the Commissioner's construed motion for summary judgment, and dismissing the action. After finding that no timely objections had been filed and that the recommendation contained no clear error, the district court adopted the memorandum and recommendation and dismissed the cause of action.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005)
- *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

Luna

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT March 06, 2026

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

ROEL L.,¹ §

§ Plaintiff, § §

VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00083

§

LELAND DUDEK, §

§ Defendant. §

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION

On February 10, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation” (D.E. 14), recommending that Roel’s construed motion for summary judgment (D.E. 9) be denied, the Commissioner’s construed motion for summary judgment (D.E. 12) be granted, and this cause of action be dismissed. The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been timely filed. When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and 1 Pursuant to the May 1, 2018 “Memorandum Re: Privacy Concern Regarding Social Security and Immigration Opinions” issued by the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States, this order uses only Plaintiff’s first name and last initial. recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (Sth Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (Sth Cir. 1996)). Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation (D.E. 14), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court ADOPTS as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, Roel’s motion (D.E. 9) is DENIED, the Commissioner’s motion (D.E. 12) is GRANTED, and this cause of action is DISMISSED. ORDERED on March 6, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2/2