

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 WACO DIVISION

ALBERT J. TURK and SHELLEY TURK,
 Plaintiffs,

v.

SOMERVELL COUNTY HOSPITAL
 DISTRICT and RAY REYNOLDS,
*individually and in his capacity as Chief Executive
 Officer of Glen Rose Medical Center–Somervell
 County Hospital District,*

Defendants.

§
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §

6:15-CV-231-RP

ORDER

Plaintiffs Albert J. Turk and Shelley Turk filed this suit against Somervell County Hospital District and Ray Reynolds (collectively, “Defendants”) on August 6, 2015. (Dkt. 1). Plaintiffs allege Defendants violated their First Amendment right to free speech and to petition the government for redress of grievances, as well as violations of the Texas Constitution. Albert Turk further alleges that Defendants violated his Fourteenth Amendment right to due process.

Defendants subsequently filed motions for summary judgment as to both Plaintiffs. (Dkts. 87, 88). The undersigned referred both motions to United States Magistrate Judge Jeffrey Manske for reports and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, and Rule 1(d) of Appendix C of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

The magistrate judge subsequently filed reports and recommendations regarding both of Defendants’ motions for summary judgment, recommending that the motions be denied. (Dkts. 107, 108). Defendants timely filed objections, (Dkts. 109, 110), entitling them to *de novo* review of the portions of the reports and recommendations to which they have objected. *See* 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1)(C) (“A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations to which objection is made.”).

The Court has undertaken a *de novo* review of the briefs filed concerning Defendant’s motions for summary judgment. Having thoroughly reviewed the magistrate judge’s comprehensive findings and conclusions and finding no error, the Court will accept and adopt the reports and recommendations for the reasons stated therein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants’ objections to the reports and recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkts. 109, 110), are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the reports and recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkts. 107, 108), are hereby **ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED** by the Court. Defendants’ motions for summary judgment, (Dkts. 87, 88), are **DENIED**.

SIGNED on April 30, 2018.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE