

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION**

Robert Bacot v. Sgt. Deborah Crawford, et al.

Bacot · No. 6:24-cv-61-JDK-KNM · Decided February 24, 2026

OPINION

Bacot

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

ROBERT BACOT, #02493790, §

§ Plaintiff, § § v. § Case No. 6:24-cv-61-JDK-KNM § SGT. DEBORAH CRAWFORD, et al., § §
Defendants. §

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff Robert Bacot, a prisoner confined within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights lawsuit complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights while incarcerated in the Cherokee County Jail. The case was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case. Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 12) recommending that Plaintiff's lawsuit be dismissed, with prejudice, for the failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff with an acknowledgment card; the docket reflects that Plaintiff received a copy of the Report. Docket No. 13. However, to date, Plaintiff neither filed objections nor otherwise responded to the Report. This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Assn*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en bane), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous,

abuse of discretion and contrary to law.”). Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 12) as the findings of this Court. Accordingly, it ORDERED that Plaintiffs lawsuit is DISMISSED, with prejudice, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). Any and all motions which may be pending in this case are DENIED as moot. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 24th day of February, 2026.

JHREMYD. KERN DLE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE