IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND/ODESSA DIVISION

ROSA ACOSTA, BRENDA GEIGER, JANET GUZMAN, TIFFANY GRAY, and SANDRA VALENCIA,
Plaintiffs,

v.

REYNA LUCIANO,
Defendant.

§§§§§§§§§§§§§§§

MO:25-CV-00307-DC

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is United States Magistrate Judge Ronald C. Griffin's Report and Recommendation[1] concerning Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment as to Liability, for Permanent Injunctive Relief, and for Leave to Supplement the Record Regarding Damages ("Default Motion")[2] and Plaintiffs Supplemental Motion for Final Default Judgment and Application for Attorney Fees ("Supplemental Motion").[3]

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a party may serve and file specific, written objections to a Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy and, in doing so, secure *de novo* review by the district court. When no objections are timely filed, a district court reviews the Magistrate Judge's report and

[1] Doc. 43.
[2] Doc. 39.
[3] Doc. 41.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

recommendation for clear error.[4] No objection having been filed, the Court's review is straightforward: clear error.

Finding none, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R *in toto* and **ORDERS** that the Supplemental Motion[5] be **GRANTED**. The Default Motion[6] is hereby **DENIED as moot**.

A separate Final Judgment will follow.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED this 2nd day of November, 2026.



DAVID COUNTS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

[4] *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note ("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 in order to accept the recommendation.").
[5] Doc. 41.
[6] Doc. 39.