

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

Fierra Hall v. Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation

Hall · No. 5:25-CV-13-RWS-JBB · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation in the absence of objections. The court denied Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation’s motion to dismiss Fierra Hall’s complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert W. Schroeder III
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-CV-13-RWS-JBB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint. A magistrate judge recommended denying the motion, and the district court adopted the recommendation and denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation under a clearly erroneous, abuse-of-discretion, and contrary-to-law standard; an aggrieved party is generally barred from de novo district-court review and, absent plain error, appellate review of unobjected-to findings and conclusions adopted by the district court.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation?
2. Whether to adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation denying Defendant's motion to dismiss.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed, an aggrieved party is barred from de novo review by the district court and, except for plain error, from appellate review of factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court.
2. The magistrate judge's report and recommendation was correct and was adopted as the findings and conclusions of the district court; Defendant's motion to dismiss was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Because no objections have been filed, any aggrieved party is barred from de novo review by the District Court of the Magistrate Judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court." (2)

"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." (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive underlying facts concerning the parties' dispute. It concerns Defendant's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint and the magistrate judge's recommendation that the motion be denied.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Boone Baxter under 28 U.S.C. § 636. On November 7, 2025, the magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation recommending denial of Pilgrim's Pride Corporation's motion to dismiss. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the report and recommendation as its findings and conclusions before denying the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Duarte v. City of Lewisville, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017)
- Arriaga v. Laxminarayan, No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021)

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

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION FIERRA HALL, § § Plaintiff, § § v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-CV-
13-RWS-JBB § PILGRIM'S PRIDE CORPORATION, § § Defendant. § ORDER Before the
Court is Defendant Pilgrim's Pride Corporation's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint. Docket
No. 8.

The above-captioned case was heretofore referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Boone Baxter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. Docket No. 2. On November 7, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation, recommending the denial of Defendant's motion. Docket No. 37. No objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed.

Because no objections have been filed, any aggrieved party is barred from de novo review by the District Court of the Magistrate Judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and, except upon grounds of plain error, 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*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir.

2017); *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, 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 and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is correct. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.

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."). The Court hereby adopts the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 37) as the findings and conclusions of this Court.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that Defendant Pilgrim's Pride Corporation's motion (Docket No. 8) is DENIED. So ORDERED and SIGNED this 25th day of November, 2025. [dohert LU Lbpectsr
C2. ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Page 2 of 2