

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

Pshatoia LaRose v. Jalen Hurts and Philadelphia Eagles, LLC

LaRose · No. 4:24-cv-04843 · Decided March 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation in Pshatoia LaRose’s pro se action against Jalen Hurts and Philadelphia Eagles, LLC. The court overrules LaRose’s objections, finds no clear error, grants the Eagles’ motion to dismiss, and dismisses all claims with prejudice based on res judicata.

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, Houston Division
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-04843
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending dismissal with prejudice under res judicata. Plaintiff's motion to vacate was construed as objections to the recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews de novo those portions of a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation to which a party specifically objects. Portions without specific objection may be accepted if no clear error appears on the face of the record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reporter citation and source metadata identifying precedential status as unknown.
PARTIES	Pshatoia LaRose v. Jalen Hurts, Philadelphia Eagles, LLC

TOPICS

res judicata

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

intellectual property

invasion of privacy

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

intellectual property

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion to vacate constituted specific objections requiring de novo review of the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation.
2. Whether the Memorandum and Recommendation should be adopted and Plaintiff's claims dismissed with prejudice based on the absence of meritorious objections and the recommendation that the claims were barred by res judicata.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court reviews de novo those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party specifically objects and may accept unobjected-to portions upon finding no clear error.
2. Plaintiff's objections were overruled because they lacked merit and did not specifically challenge the conclusion that her claims were barred by res judicata.
3. The Memorandum and Recommendation was adopted, Philadelphia Eagles, LLC's motion to dismiss was granted, and all claims asserted by Plaintiff were dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The objections by Plaintiff Pshatoia LaRose to the Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are OVERRULED." (at 2)

"The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court." (at 2)

"All claims asserted by Plaintiff Pshatoia LaRose in this action are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Pshatoia LaRose sued Jalen Hurts and Philadelphia Eagles, LLC, asserting claims including unauthorized use of intellectual property, invasion of privacy, stalking, harassment, and phone identity hacks. The Eagles moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim, while Hurts withdrew his motion after stating that he intended to assert res judicata against any amended complaint. Plaintiff was given time to retain counsel and file an amended complaint but never filed one.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed claims against Jalen Hurts and Philadelphia Eagles, LLC, including claims concerning unauthorized use of intellectual property, invasion of privacy, stalking, harassment, and phone identity hacks. Philadelphia Eagles, LLC moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim; Hurts initially moved to dismiss but withdrew that motion after indicating an intent to assert res judicata against an amended complaint. Plaintiff did

not file an amended complaint. The magistrate judge recommended granting the Eagles' motion and dismissing all claims against both defendants with prejudice. After de novo review of Plaintiff's objections, the district court overruled them, adopted the recommendation, granted the Eagles' motion, and dismissed all claims with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)
- 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 14, 2026 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION PSHATOIA LAROSE, § CIVIL ACTION NUMBER Plaintiff, § 4:24-cv-04843 § § versus § JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE § § JALEN HURTS and § PHILADELPHIA EAGLES, § LLC, § Defendants. § ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION Plaintiff Pshatoia LaRose proceeds here pro se.

She sues Defendants Jalen Hurts and Philadelphia Eagles, LLC. Dkt 1. She brings various claims for, among other things, unauthorized use of intellectual property, invasion of privacy, stalking and harassment, and “phone identity hacks.” Id at 2.

The matter was referred for disposition to Magistrate Judge Yvonne Ho. Dkt 5. The Eagles and Hurts both moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim. Dkts 9 & 11. In conjunction with that, Judge Ho allowed Plaintiff time as requested to retain counsel, with further order to file an amended complaint. Hurts withdrew his pending motion, stating intention to assert res judicata against the amended complaint, but Plaintiff never thereafter filed one.

See Dkt 19 at 4; see also Dkt 15 at 2 (minute entry noting withdrawal). Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending that the motion by the Eagles be granted and that all claims against the Eagles be dismissed with prejudice. Dkt 19 at 6–10. It further recommends that the claims against Hurts be dismissed with prejudice sua sponte. Id at 10–11. These recommendations relied upon argument that Plaintiff’s claims are equally barred against both by res judicata.

Id at 6–11. 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 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, en banc); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

Plaintiff filed a motion to vacate the Memorandum and Recommendation, which is construed here to be objections to such. Dkt 20. On de novo review and determination, the objections clearly lack merit. Plaintiff nowhere addresses the argument that her claims are barred by res judicata. See *id* at 1–2. This means that she doesn't specifically object to the portion of the Memorandum and Recommendation supporting dismissal of her claims.

See Dkt 19 at 6–11. The objections by Plaintiff Pshatoia LaRose to the Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are OVERRULED. Dkt 20. No clear error otherwise appears upon review and consideration of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law.

The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 19. The motion by Defendant Philadelphia Eagles, LLC, to dismiss is GRANTED. Dkt 9. All claims asserted by Plaintiff Pshatoia LaRose in this action are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. A final judgment will enter separately. SO ORDERED. Signed on March 13, 2026, at Houston, Texas.

Es é Honorable Charles ge United States District Judge