

**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

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