

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

Darrell Anthony Williams v. Hooper, et al.

Williams v. Hooper · No. 2:25-CV-00319 · Decided February 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopted a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation after no timely objections were filed. The court denied the plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis, denied as moot the motions for preliminary injunction, temporary restraining order, and court-ordered surgery, and dismissed the action without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
DECIDED	February 23, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00319
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation after no party timely objected.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation, the district court reviews the record for clear error on its face before accepting the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	district court order; precedential status not stated

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- injunctions
- equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation?
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation and dismiss the action without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation.
2. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions, denied the pending motions, and dismissed the action without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Darrell Anthony Williams had pending motions to proceed in forma pauperis, for a preliminary injunction, for an emergency temporary restraining order, and for court-ordered surgery. A magistrate judge recommended denying all pending motions and dismissing the action. No timely objections were filed, and the district court found no clear error in the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 21, 2026, Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton recommended denying all pending motions and dismissing the action. The parties received notice and an opportunity to object, but no timely objections were filed. The district court found no clear error, adopted the memorandum and recommendation, denied the pending motions, and dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005)
- *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT February 23, 2026 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION DARRELL ANTHONY WILLIAMS, § §
Plaintiff, § § VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00319 § HOOPER, et al., § § Defendants. §

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION On January 21, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation” (D.E.

45), recommending that all pending motions (D.E. 2, 6, 7, 28) be denied and this action be dismissed. The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002- 13. No objections have been timely filed. When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation.

Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc., 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)). Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation (D.E. 45), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court ADOPTS as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court: e DENIES Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (D.E. 2); e DENIES as MOOT Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (D.E. 6), emergency motion for temporary restraining order (D.E. 7), and motion for court ordered surgery (D.E. 28); and e DISMISSES this action WITHOUT PREJUDICE. ORDERED on February 23, 2026. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 2/2