

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
TEXAS, AUSTIN DIVISION**

**Robert, formerly known as William Bowman v. State of Texas Vital  
Statistics Registrar Office**

Robert · No. 1:25-CV-00381-DAE · Decided November 21, 2025

---

**OPINION**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION  
ROBERT, formerly known as § No. 1:25-CV-00381-DAE WILLIAM BOWMAN, § § Plaintiff, §  
§ vs. § § STATE OF TEXAS VITAL § STATISTICS REGISTRAR OFFICE. § § Defendant. §  
ORDER Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) filed by U.S. Magistrate  
Judge Mark Lane on March 31, 2025.

(Dkt # 4.) The Report granted Plaintiff Robert’s (“Plaintiff” or “Robert”) application to proceed in  
forma pauperis and reviewed is pro se Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The Magistrate  
Judge recommended dismissing all of Robert’s claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Dkt.  
# 4 at 2–4.) Robert filed objections to the Report on April 10, 2025.

(Dkt. # 7.) The Court finds this matter suitable for disposition without a hearing. First, after clear  
error review of Robert’s objections to the Report<sup>1</sup>, as well as 1 Robert’s objections do not point to  
any specific error in the Report’s analysis. Instead, the objections seem to acknowledge the court’s  
lack of jurisdiction and Plaintiff suggests he seeks to “start over the right way.” Such “frivolous,  
careful consideration of the record and the governing law, the Court ADOPTS the Report in full as  
the opinion of the Court.

(Dkt. # 4.) Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES all of Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant for lack  
of subject matter jurisdiction. BACKGROUND On March 14, 2025, Robert filed a Complaint  
against Defendant State of Texas Vital Statistics Registrar Office, seeking to change his name.  
(Dkt. # 1.) He claims his name was changed when he was a child, and he seeks to revert to his  
name given at birth.

(Id.) Plaintiff seeks no monetary penalty and is “simply seeking a rescission/annulment of the  
legally changed name and birth certificate contract.” (Dkt. # 1 at 4.) Magistrate Judge Lane  
recommended the case be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because the case does not present a  
federal question and diversity jurisdiction is not alleged in the complaint.

(Dkt. # 4.) LEGAL STANDARD I. Review of Report and Recommendation The Court must  
conduct a de novo review of any of the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions to which a party has

specifically objected. See 28 U.S.C. conclusive, or general objections” do not merit de novo review. *Battle v. United States Parole Comm’n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir.1987).

Here, the Court finds that Robert’s objections lack merit as they do not object to anything in the Report. Accordingly, the Court applies a clear-error standard of review. § 636(b)(1)(C). The objections must specifically identify those findings or recommendations that the party wishes to have the district court consider. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 151 (1985).

A district court need not consider “[f]rivolous, conclusive, or general objections.” *Battle v. U.S. Parole Comm’n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987). “A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Findings to which no specific, genuine objections are made do not require de novo review; the Court need only determine whether the Recommendation is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989). DISCUSSION Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation, the relevant filings, and the applicable law, the Court finds no error in Judge Lane’s well- reasoned analysis. Plaintiff’s objections to the Report do not challenge any specific findings. (Dkt. # 5.) Plaintiff merely generally alleges that “in equity the name change should not have happened” and appears to admit that “[i]f theres [sic] nothing that can be done through the courts the Lord may need to sort it out.” (Id.)

The Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that this Court lacks jurisdiction over this matter. Even affording Plaintiff the full benefit of his pro se status, his objections raise no new arguments of substance. A district court need not consider “Tf]rivolous, conclusive, or general objections.” *Battle*, 834 F.2d at 421.

The Court finds that Plaintiff’s objections do not identify any specific factual error or legal misapplication warranting rejection of the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions. Accordingly, the Court OVERRULES Plaintiff’s objections. (Dkt. #7.)

The Report is ADOPTED in full. CONCLUSION For the reasons given, the Court ADOPTS U.S. Magistrate Judge Lane’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 4) in full and DISMISSES under all claims against Defendant for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The Clerk is INSTRUCTED to CLOSE THE CASE. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: Austin, Texas, November 21, 2025. 4 Senior U.S. District Judge