

ENTERED

February 13, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

JULIUS LAMUNN	§	CIVIL ACTION NO
NORTH,	§	4:24-cv-02366
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
	§	
vs.	§	JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE
	§	
	§	
BONIAL &	§	
ASSOCIATES P.C. and	§	
IDAHO HOUSING	§	
AND FINANCE	§	
ASSOCOATION,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Julius Lamunn North, a *pro se* litigant, filed an action in state court alleging violations under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. Dkt 1-5 (complaint). Plaintiff alleges that the foreclosure attempt on his property constitutes harassment and false representation under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. Id at 3. Defendant removed the action to federal court. Dkt 1.

Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Peter Bray dated October 11, 2024. Dkt 30. He recommends that (1) the motion by Plaintiff (Dkt 8) to remand be denied because jurisdiction in federal court is proper, (2) the motion by Plaintiff (Dkt 9) for preliminary injunction be denied because Plaintiff hasn't shown a likelihood of success on the merits, (3) the motion by Defendant (Dkt 19) to consolidate this case with 4:24-cv-03010 be granted, (4) the motions by Plaintiff (Dkts 20, 21, 23 & 26) for sanctions and to disqualify be denied, and

(5) the motion by Defendant (Dkt 29) to declare Plaintiff a vexatious litigant be denied without prejudice. See Dkt 30 at 1.

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 F2d 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).

None of the parties filed objections. 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 30.

The following motions are DENIED: Dkts 8, 9, 20, 21, 23, 26 & 29.

The following motion is GRANTED: Dkt 19.

SO ORDERED.

Signed on February 13, 2025, at Houston, Texas.



Hon. Charles Eskridge
United States District Judge