

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
TEXAS, CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

Sidney Ray Snellings v. United States of America, et al.

Snellings · No. 2:26-CV-0029 · Decided April 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation without objection. The court denied Plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, denied the motion for a preliminary injunction as moot, and ordered notice to the district’s Three Strikes List manager.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division                                                                                                 |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | David Morales                                                                                                                                                                            |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division                                                                                                 |
| DECIDED               | April 7, 2026                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DOCKET                | 2:26-CV-0029                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation after no party filed a timely objection.                                                                  |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error or whether it is contrary to law. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unknown                                                                                                                                                                                  |

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- injunctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- federal courts

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation should be adopted when the district court finds it neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis should be denied, the complaint dismissed without prejudice, and the motion for preliminary injunction denied as moot.

## HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine whether the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2. The district court may adopt an unobjected-to memorandum and recommendation in its entirety when, after review, it is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
3. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis was denied, the complaint was dismissed without prejudice, and the motion for preliminary injunction was denied as moot.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge’s M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” (1)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Sidney Ray Snellings filed a civil complaint, a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, and a motion for preliminary injunction. The magistrate judge recommended denying in forma pauperis status, dismissing the complaint without prejudice, and denying the preliminary-injunction motion as moot. The recommendation also called for notice of the dismissal to the Manager of the Three Strikes List for the Southern District of Texas.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Jason Libby recommended denying Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, dismissing the complaint without prejudice, denying the motion for preliminary injunction as moot, and notifying the Manager of the Three Strikes List for the Southern District of Texas. After receiving no objections, the district court reviewed the recommendation under the clearly erroneous or contrary-to-law standard, adopted it in its entirety, and directed the Clerk to provide the required notice. The court stated that final judgment would be entered separately.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)

- Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P., No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015)

## OPINION

Southern District of Texas ENTERED UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT eee SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION SIDNEY RAY SNELLINGS, § § Plaintiff, § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:26-CV-0029 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ef al., Defendants. ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM & RECOMMENDATION Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Jason Libby's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R").

(D.E. 14). The M&R recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion to proceed IFP, dismiss his complaint without prejudice, deny as moot his motion for preliminary injunction, and send notice of this dismissal to the Manager of the Three Strikes List for the Southern District of Texas. /d. at 5.

The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. Civ. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (Sth Cir. 1989) (per curiam); Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P., No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*I (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.) (citation omitted). Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court ADOPTS the M&R in its entirety.

(D.E. 14). Accordingly, the Court 1/2 DENIES Plaintiff's motion to proceed IFP, (D.E. 3), DISMISSES his complaint without prejudice, and DENIES as moot his motion for preliminary injunction, (D.E. 2). The Court ORDERS the Clerk of Court to send notice of this dismissal to the Manager of the Three Strikes List for the Southern District of Texas at Three\_Strikes@txs.uscourts.gov.

The Court will enter final judgment separately. Zt SO ORDERED. ( DAVID ORALES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Signed: Corpus Christi, Texas April Ww 2026 2/2