

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

La Prendia Danielle William v. Judge Charles Eskridge, Patricia S.
Collins, and Bureau of Engraving and Printing

William · No. 4:25-cv-05277 · Decided March 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after the pro se plaintiff failed to comply with an order requiring a typed complaint with correct contact information. The court dismissed the action with prejudice and directed that a final judgment enter separately.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles Eskridge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas
DECIDED	March 27, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-cv-05277
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed suit in state court. Defendants removed the action, moved for a more definite statement, and obtained a magistrate judge's order requiring Plaintiff to file a typed complaint with correct contact information. After Plaintiff failed to comply, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal with prejudice. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews de novo those portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a party specifically objects. Portions without specific objection may be accepted upon review for clear error on the face of the record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.

TOPICS

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no party filed objections and no clear error appeared on the face of the record.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice because Plaintiff failed to comply with the order requiring a typed complaint with correct contact information.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party files objections, the district court may accept the unobjected-to portions of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after determining that no clear error appears on the face of the record; the court adopted the Report and Recommendation here.
2. The action was properly dismissed with prejudice after Plaintiff failed to comply with the magistrate judge's order requiring a typed complaint with correct contact information.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"No clear error appears upon review of the Report and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law."

"The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court."

"This action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff proceeded pro se and filed a handwritten state-court petition that Defendants alleged was illegible and contained incorrect contact information. After removal, the magistrate judge ordered Plaintiff to file a typed complaint with correct contact information by December 12, 2025. Plaintiff failed to comply with that order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

La Prendia Danielle William sued Patricia Solimene, formerly Collins, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in state court. Defendants removed the case and moved for a more definite statement because the handwritten petition was allegedly illegible and contained incorrect contact information. Magistrate Judge Dena Hanovice Palermo granted the motion, ordered a typed complaint by December 12, 2025, and later recommended dismissal with prejudice when Plaintiff failed to comply. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the recommendation after finding no clear error.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989)
- Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc., 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005)
- Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc)

OPINION

March 27, 2026 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION LA PRENDIA DANIELLE § CIVIL ACTION NUMBER WILLIAM, § 4:25-cv-05277 Plaintiff, § § § versus § JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE § § PATRICIA S. COLLINS and § BUREAU OF ENGRAVING § AND PRINTING, § Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Plaintiff La Prendia Danielle William proceeds here pro se.

She sued Defendants Patricia Solimene (formerly Collins) and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in state court. See Dkt 1-2 (original petition). Defendants removed. Dkt 1. The matter was referred for disposition to Magistrate Judge Dena Hanovice Palermo. Dkt 6. Defendants moved for more definite statement, alleging that Plaintiff's handwritten petition is illegible and contains incorrect contact information.

See Dkt 5. Judge Palermo granted the motion and ordered Plaintiff to file a typed complaint with correct contact information by December 12, 2025. Dkt 8. Plaintiff failed to do so. Judge Palermo then entered a Report and Recommendation recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice given failure to comply with prior order. Dkt 13.

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 F.2d 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 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing Douglass v United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, en banc); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

No party filed objections. No clear error appears upon review of the Report and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law. The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 13. This action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. A final judgment will enter separately. SO ORDERED. Signed on March 27, 2026, at Houston, Texas.

ABE. Honorable Charles Egkridge United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-te/2026/la-prendia-danielle-william-v-judge-charles-eskridge-plu000t8>