

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, MONROE DIVISION

Nolan Joseph Bardell v. Wal-Mart, Inc.

Civil Action No. 25-1406 (W.D. La. Mar. 18, 2026) · No. Civil Action No. 25-1406; 3:25-cv-01406 · Decided
March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana denied Nolan Joseph Bardell’s appeal of a magistrate judge’s denial of his motion for a protective order. The court held that the magistrate judge’s non-dispositive order was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Monroe Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Alexander C. Van Hook
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-1406; 3:25-cv-01406
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff objected to the magistrate judge's denial of his motion for a protective order. The district court construed the objection as an appeal of a non-dispositive pretrial order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A magistrate judge's final order on a non-dispositive pretrial matter is reviewed under the clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard. De novo review applies to a magistrate judge's recommendation, but not to the non-dispositive order at issue.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Nolan Joseph Bardell v. Wal-Mart, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- standard of review
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Bardell's objection to the magistrate judge's denial of a motion for a protective order should be construed as an appeal.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's non-dispositive order denying the motion for a protective order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

HOLDINGS

1. An objection to a magistrate judge's non-dispositive order may be construed as an appeal.
2. The magistrate judge's denial of Bardell's motion for a protective order was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law, and the appeal was properly denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*“on a non-dispositive matter that requires the district court to uphold the ruling unless it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” (*1)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Nolan Joseph Bardell, proceeding pro se, sought a protective order. The magistrate judge denied the motion, and Bardell challenged that ruling through an objection that the district court treated as an appeal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge denied Bardell's motion for a protective order in a memorandum order. Bardell filed an objection, which the district court construed as an appeal and denied after reviewing the record and finding no clear error or legal error.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Chovanec v. Police Dept. City of Monroe, No. 11-1798, 2012 WL 2376195, at *1 (W.D. La. June 22, 2012)
- Seaberry v. Stalder, No. 05-1960, 2006 WL 1635707, at *1 (W.D. La. June 13, 2006)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA MONROE
DIVISION NOLAN JOSEPH BARDELL CIVIL ACTION NO. 25-1406 VERSUS JUDGE
ALEXANDER C. VAN HOOK WAL-MART, INC. MAGISTRATE JUDGE MCCLUSKY

ORDER Nolan Joseph Bardell, proceeding pro se, has filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's denial of his Motion for a Protective Order, which the Court construes as an appeal.

Record Document 19; see, e.g., *Chovanec v. Police Dept. City of Monroe*, No. 11-1798, 2012 WL 2376195, at *1 (W.D. La. June 22, 2012) (construing an objection to a non-dispositive order as an appeal). A magistrate judge may rule on any non-dispositive pretrial matter, except those proscribed by statute. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).

In this case, the Magistrate Judge's ruling is not a recommendation, which normally requires de novo review, but rather, the ruling is a final order "on a non-dispositive matter that requires the district court to uphold the ruling unless it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law." *Seaberry v. Stalder*, No. 05-1960, 2006 WL 1635707, at *1 (W.D. La. June 13, 2006) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)).

Following a review of the record, including the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum Order, Record Document 17, and Bardell's appeal styled as an objection, Record Document 21, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum Order is well-reasoned and neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Bardell's appeal, Record Document 19, is DENIED. DONE AND SIGNED at Shreveport, Louisiana, this 18th day of March, 2026.

ALEXANDER C. VAN HOOK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE