

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

**Christina Flores v. The Law Firm of Derek Williams, LLC d/b/a
Infinite Law Group**

Flores · No. 6:25-cv-23-JDK-KNM · Decided April 2, 2026

OPINION

Flores

PER CURIAM.

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

CHRISTINA FLORES, §

§ Plaintiff, § § v. § Case No. 6:25-cv-23-JDK-KNM §

THE LAW FIRM OF DEREK §

WILLIAMS, LLC d/b/a INFINITE §

LAW GROUP, §

§ Defendant. §

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff filed this action against Defendant The Law Firm of Derek Williams, LLC, alleging violations of various state and federal consumer protection statutes. Docket No. 1. Defendant appeared through counsel and filed an answer. Docket No. 15. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636. Defendant has been unrepresented since its counsel withdrew in September 2025. As a limited liability company, Defendant cannot represent itself in federal court. See, e.g., *Rowland v. California Men's Colony*, 506 U.S. 194, 201–02

(1993) (“[T]he lower courts have uniformly held that 28 U.S.C. § 1654 . . . does not allow corporations, partnerships, or associations to appear in federal court otherwise than by licensed counsel.”). Judge Mitchell therefore ordered Defendant to provide a status update regarding its efforts to obtain new counsel. Docket No. 27. After no status update was forthcoming, Judge Mitchell issued an order to show cause why the Court should not strike Defendant’s answer from the record and allow Plaintiff to pursue default judgment. Docket No. 32. Despite acknowledging receipt of Judge Mitchell’s orders, Defendant neither obtained new counsel nor otherwise responded. Docket No. 30; Docket No. 33. Accordingly, on March 8, 2026, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court strike

Defendant's answer from the record, order the Clerk to enter default against Defendant, and order Plaintiff to file a motion for default judgment within 30 days of the Clerk's entry of default. Docket No. 34. Defendant acknowledged receipt of the Report and Recommendation on March 16, 2026. Docket No. 35. No written objections have been filed, and the time for filing objections has passed. 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. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), 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, no objections were filed. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews her legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 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 Recommendation, 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. 34) as the opinion of this Court. Defendant's answer (Docket No. 15) is STRICKEN, and the Clerk is ORDERED to enter default against Defendant. Plaintiff is ORDERED to file a motion for default judgment within 30 days of the Clerk's entry of default. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 2nd day of April, 2026.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE