

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

Damiena Trumel Heard v. Jordan McCormick, et al.

Heard · No. 25-1723-P · Decided February 24, 2026

OPINION

Heard

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
SHREVEPORT DIVISION

DAMIENA TRUMEL HEARD CIVIL ACTION NO. 25-1723-P
VERSUS JUDGE HICKS

JORDAN MCCORMICK, ET AL. MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with the standing order of this court, this matter was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for review, report and recommendation.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Before the court is a civil rights complaint filed in forma pauperis by pro se plaintiff Damiena Trumel Heard (“Plaintiff”), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This complaint was received and filed in this court on November 7, 2025. Plaintiff was incarcerated at the Bossier Maximum Security Center in Plain Dealing, Louisiana, when he filed this complaint. He names Jordan McCormick, Russell Engi, Schyler Marvin, IDB Board, and Bossier City as defendants. This court granted Plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis on January 8, 2026 [Doc. 3]. However, that order was returned to this court on January 16, 2026, by the United States Postal Service marked “RETURN TO SENDER -released.” To date, Plaintiff has not informed this court of his new address. Accordingly; IT IS RECOMMENDED that this complaint be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, sua sponte, for failure to prosecute, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as interpreted by the court and under the court's inherent power to control its own docket. See *Link v. Wabash Railroad Company*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962); *Rogers v. Kroger Company*, 669 F.2d 317, 320-321 (5th Cir. 1982).

OBJECTIONS

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court unless an extension of time is granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may respond to another party’s objections within fourteen (14)

days after being served with a copy thereof. Counsel are directed to furnish a courtesy copy of any objections or responses to the District Judge at the time of filing. A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation set forth above, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the proposed factual findings and legal conclusions that were accepted by the district court and that were not objected to by the aforementioned party. See *Douglas v. U.S.A.A.*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc). Page 2 of 3 **THUS DONE AND SIGNED**, in chambers, at Shreveport, Louisiana, on this 23rd day of February 2026. Mark L. Hornsby U.S. Magistrate Judge Page 3 of 3