

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

Israel Avila v. Saminiego Jr. Placido, et al.

No. 2:26-CV-00023, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
(April 8, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas adopts a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation after finding no timely objections or clear error. The court denies Israel Avila’s motion to reopen the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nelva Gonzales Ramos
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division
DECIDED	April 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-CV-00023
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	District court review of a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation denying Plaintiff's motion to reopen the case.
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 the face of the record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Israel Avila v. Saminiego Jr. Placido, et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation when no timely objection was filed.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motion to reopen the case should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation.
2. Plaintiff's motion to reopen the case is denied.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiff's motion to reopen a previously closed case. A magistrate judge recommended denying the motion, and Plaintiff did not timely object after receiving notice and an opportunity to do so.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 3, 2026, Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued a memorandum and recommendation recommending denial of Plaintiff's motion to reopen the case. Plaintiff received notice and an opportunity to object but filed no timely objections. The district court reviewed the record, found no clear error, adopted the memorandum and recommendation, and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

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 April 08, 2026 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION ISRAEL AVILA, § § Plaintiff, § § VS. §
CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:26-CV-00023 § SAMINIEGO JR. PLACIDO, et al., § § Defendants. §
ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO REOPEN CASE On March 3, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K.
Hampton issued her "Memorandum and Recommendation to Deny Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen
Case" (D.E.

15). Plaintiff was 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. 15), 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, Plaintiff's motion to reopen case (D.E. 13) is DENIED. ORDERED on April 8, 2026.
Lele GONZAIGS RAMOS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 2/2