

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

**Orr Auto, Inc. d/b/a Orr Volkswagen of Texarkana v. Autoplex
Extended Services LLC d/b/a Motor Vehicle Services**

Orr Auto · No. 5:24-CV-29-RWS-JBB · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation concerning Defendant Autoplex Extended Services LLC's motion for relief from default judgment. Because no objections were filed, the court reviews the recommendation under the applicable deferential standard and denies the motion.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION ORR AUTO, INC. d/b/a ORR § VOLKSWAGEN OF TEXARKANA,
§ § Plaintiff, § § v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:24-CV-29-RWS-JBB § AUTOPLEX EXTENDED
SERVICES § LLC d/b/a MOTOR VEHICLE § SERVICES, § § Defendant. § ORDER Before the
Court is Defendant Autoplex Extended Services LLC's Motion for Relief from Default Judgment.

Docket No. 40. The above-captioned case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Boone Baxter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On December 3, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending the denial of Defendant's motion. Docket No. 51.

As of this date, no objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed. Because no objections have been filed, any aggrieved party is barred from de novo review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Moreover, except upon grounds of plain error, an aggrieved party is barred from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. See *Duarte v. City of Lewisville, Texas*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017); *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, Case No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (Sth Cir.), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 51) is ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further ORDERED that Defendant Autoplex Extended Services LLC's motion (Docket No. 40) is DENIED. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 23rd day of December, 2025. [dohert LU Llpectsr C2. ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Page 2 of 2