

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN DIVISION**

Kimberly Monique Christian v. Captain Stephanie Horn

Civil Action No. 3:25-CV-357-KHJ-MTP · No. 3:25-CV-357-KHJ-MTP · Decided May 18, 2026

OPINION

Christian

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

NORTHERN DIVISION

KIMBERLY MONIQUE CHRISTIAN PLAINTIFF

V. CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:25-CV-357-KHJ-MTP

CAPTAIN STEPHANIE HORN DEFENDANT

ORDER

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Michael T. Parker’s [75] Report and Recommendations. For the reasons below, the Court adopts the [75] Report and dismisses this case without prejudice. Pro se Plaintiff Kimberly Monique Christian (“Christian”) initiated this suit in May 2025. Compl. [1]. She amended her complaint in July 2025. First Am. Compl. [13]. Then, Defendant Stephanie Horn moved to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Mot. to Dismiss [16] at 1. The Court granted the [16] Motion but allowed Christian 14 days to amend her complaint. Order [33]. Christian filed multiple motions for leave to amend. [34, 53, 60] Mots. for Leave to Amend. The Court eventually granted the [53] Motion for Leave to Amend and instructed Christian to file the [53-1] Proposed Amended Complaint as a separate entry on the docket by April 10, 2026. Order [66] at 4–5. She attempted to do so twice. Am. Compls. [67, 69]. But both times, she docketed an amended complaint that had not been approved. So the Court struck both attempted amended complaints.¹ Orders [68, 74]. The [75] Report points out that this case has not had an operative complaint since January 5, 2026. [75] at 4. Though the Court has given Christian ample opportunities to amend her complaint, she failed to properly do so. Thus, the [75] Report recommends dismissing this case without prejudice for lack of an operative complaint and failure to comply with court orders. [75] 4–5. Written objections to the [75] Report were due by May 15, 2026. at 5. The [75] Report notified the parties that failure to file written objections by that date would bar further appeal in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636. No party objected to the [75] Report, and the time to do so has passed. The Court must review de novo a magistrate judge’s report only when a party objects to the report within 14 days after being served with a copy. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no party timely objects to the report, the Court applies “the ‘clearly

erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law' standard of review." , 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam). Finding the [75] Report neither clearly erroneous, contrary to law, nor an abuse of discretion, the Court adopts the [75] Report and dismisses this case without prejudice. In doing so, the Court has considered all arguments raised. 1 Both attempted amended complaints added several defendants, and the CM/ECF case caption currently lists these defendants. [67, 69]. But because the Court struck the attempted amended complaints, Christian never properly added those defendants. Per the operative complaint—the [13] First Amended Complaint—Horn is the only defendant in this case. Those arguments not addressed would not have altered the Court's decision. The Court will enter a separate final judgment consistent with this Order. SO ORDERED, this 18th day of May, 2026. s/
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE