

**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

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-texas-corpus-christi-division-united-state/2026/roel-l-v-leland-dudek-ameljkc7>