

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

Curtis Wood v. Warden Richard Luna

No. 2:25-CV-00096, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
(January 20, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton’s Memorandum and Recommendation. The court denies Curtis Wood’s Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment because no objection was filed and the recommendation was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David S. Morales
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00096
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending denial of Petitioner's Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment. 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 M&R to determine whether it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Curtis Wood v. Warden Richard Luna

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- federal habeas corpus
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal habeas corpus

Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2. Whether Petitioner's Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment should be granted.

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 Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment is denied.

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

The petitioner sought relief through a Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment. The magistrate judge recommended that the motion be denied. The parties were given notice and an opportunity to object, but no objection was filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending denial of Curtis Wood's Rule 59(e) motion. After the parties received notice and an opportunity to object, no objection was filed. The district court reviewed the M&R under the clearly erroneous or contrary-to-law standard, adopted it in its entirety, and denied the Rule 59(e) motion.

DISPOSITION

denied

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)