

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION**

Joey Douglas Martin v. ABM Facility Services

Martin · No. 4:25-cv-04251 · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending denial of the plaintiff's motion to alter or amend the judgment. The court overrules the plaintiff's objections, finds no clear error, and denies the motion.

OPINION

March 25, 2026 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION JOEY DOUGLAS MARTIN, § CIVIL ACTION NUMBER Plaintiff, § 4:25-cv-04251 § § versus § JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE § § ABM FACILITY SERVICES, § Defendant. § ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION Plaintiff Joey Douglas Martin proceeds here pro se. He sued Defendant ABM Facility Services for claims related to garnishment of his wages.

Dkt 1 at ¶2. The matter was referred for disposition to Magistrate Judge Christina A. Bryan. Dkt 13. Prior order granted a motion by Defendant to dismiss and entered final judgment. Dkt 24; see also Dkt 7 (motion). Plaintiff now moves to alter or amend that judgment. Dkt 25. Judge Bryan entered a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending the motion be denied.

Dkt 27. The district court reviews de novo those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party has specifically objected. See FRCP 72(b)(3) & 28 USC § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989, per curiam).

The district court may accept any other portions to which there's no objection if satisfied that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, en banc); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

Plaintiff filed objections. Dkt 28. On de novo review and determination, they are scattershot and lacking in merit. In both the motion and objections, Plaintiff relies on old, unavailing arguments. He otherwise fails to demonstrate that the prior order relied on manifest legal error.

The objections by Plaintiff Joey Douglas Martin to the Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are OVERRULED. Dkt 28. No clear error otherwise appears upon review and

consideration of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law.

The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 27. The motion by Plaintiff Joey Douglas Martin to alter or amend judgment is DENIED. Dkt 25. SO ORDERED. Signed on March 25, 2026, at Houston, Texas. Z. Honorable Charles Kskridge United States District Judge