

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
TEXAS, TEXARKANA DIVISION**

**Robert Sills v. Warden, FCI-Texarkana**

Sills · No. 5:24-CV-107-RWS-JBB · Decided March 30, 2026

---

**SUMMARY**

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge's report and recommendation in Robert Sills's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas corpus petition. The court dismissed the petition as moot, without prejudice to Sills seeking any available relief from the sentencing court.

**OPINION**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TEXARKANA DIVISION ROBERT SILLS, § § Petitioner, § § v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:24-  
CV-107-RWS-JBB § WARDEN, FCI-TEXARKANA, § § Defendant. § ORDER Petitioner Robert  
Sills, proceeding pro se, filed the above-captioned petition for writ of habeas corpus under 42  
U.S.C. § 2241. Docket No. 1.

The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Boone Baxter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On February 20, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending the above application for writ of habeas corpus be dismissed as moot. Docket No. 6.

The Magistrate Judge further recommended the dismissal should not prevent Petitioner from seeking such relief as he may be entitled from the sentencing court. *Id.* at 3. A copy of the Report and Recommendation was sent to Petitioner at his last known address, return receipt requested, but was returned as undeliverable. Docket No. 7.

As of this date, no objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed. Local Rule CV-11(d) of the Local Rules of Court for the Eastern District of Texas requires that pro se litigants must provide the Court with a physical address and is responsible for keeping the Clerk of Court advised in writing of his current physical address.

Because no objections have been filed, any aggrieved party is barred from de novo review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Moreover, except upon grounds of plain error, an aggrieved party is barred from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court.

See *Duarte v. City of Lewisville, Texas*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (Sth Cir. 2017); *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, Case No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at \*1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021). The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct.

See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (Sth Cir.), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 6) is ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further ORDERED that the above-captioned petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED- AS-MOOT.

The dismissal of this petition does not prevent Petitioner from seeking such relief as he may be entitled from the sentencing court. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 30th day of March, 2026.  
[ache t+ LO Clrreche. □□□ ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Page 2 of 2