

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

Consuelo Lopez v. Dolgencorp of Texas, Inc., et al.

Lopez · No. 2:25-CV-00018 · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation after no timely objections were filed. The court grants the defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismisses the action with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lela Gonzales Ramos
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00018
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order adopting a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation granting defendants' motion for summary judgment.
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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- summary judgment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation should be adopted and defendants' motion for summary judgment granted.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation.
2. The court found no clear error, adopted the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions as its own, granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

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 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive account of the underlying dispute or facts. The material procedural facts are that defendants moved for summary judgment, the magistrate judge recommended granting the motion, and no party timely objected.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton recommended granting defendants' motion for summary judgment. The parties received notice and an opportunity to object, but no timely objections were filed. The district court reviewed the record for clear error, adopted the memorandum and recommendation, granted summary judgment, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT February 02, 2026 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION CONSUELO LOPEZ, § § Plaintiff, § §
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00018 § DOLGENCORP OF TEXAS, INC., et al., § §
Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION On

December 19, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation” (D.E.

28), recommending that the Court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (D.E. 23). 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 recommendation.

Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc., 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)). Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation (D.E. 28), 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, Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (D.E. 23) is GRANTED and this action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. ORDERED on February 2, 2026. Lela GONZAIGS RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 2/2