

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 17-50018  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

July 20, 2017

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

BRADRICK J. COLLINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY; DEAN ROBIN K. ROGERS; ASSISTANT  
PROFESSOR HELEN HARRIS,

Defendants - Appellees

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 6:15-CV-112

---

Before DAVIS, SOUTHWICK, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Bradrick Collins was admitted as a graduate student into Baylor University's Master of Social Work Program for the fall 2013 semester.<sup>1</sup> He originally applied for and was admitted into the "Standard" program. When

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

<sup>1</sup> Collins graduated with his J.D. from an accredited law school in 2013, but he is not a licensed attorney.

## No. 17-50018

the University offered Collins a chance to complete his degree through its “Advanced” program, which would allow him to graduate more quickly, Collins accepted. A prerequisite for that program was passing two candidacy classes with at least a “B” during the next summer semester. Collins took the courses but did not achieve at least a “B” in either class. Thus, the University did not admit Collins into the Advanced program. Collins filed a number of administrative appeals with the University, each of which was denied.

Collins brought claims under both federal and state law against the University and two faculty members. Each defendant moved for summary judgment. Collins responded<sup>2</sup> and sought further discovery, among other things. The magistrate judge filed a lengthy report and recommendation (“R&R”), which comprehensively dealt with Collins’s arguments and recommended that the district court grant the defendants’ motions for summary judgment and deny all other pending motions. Collins objected to the R&R. The district court adopted the recommendation, dismissed Collins’s suit with prejudice, and explained its rulings in a detailed opinion. Collins then filed several post-judgment motions, including one seeking recusal of the district judge. The district court denied the motions, and Collins appealed.

Collins presents seven arguments on appeal: (1) the district court’s order was not final; (2) the defendants failed to show their entitlement to summary judgment; (3) summary judgment was premature; (4) the district court abused its discretion by failing to justify its denial of Collins’s request for a preliminary injunction with findings and conclusions; (5) the district court failed to conduct a *de novo* review of the R&R; (6) the magistrate judge and district court erred

---

<sup>2</sup> Collins’s response was styled as a motion for summary judgment. Upon Collins’s motion, however, the magistrate judge also treated it as his response to the defendants’ motions for summary judgment. Whether it is read as a response only or as a response and motion for summary judgment does not affect our analysis.

No. 17-50018

by denying his motions to recuse (which he filed as to each of the three judges assigned to the case); and (7) the district court erred by classifying his state-law claims as borderline frivolous.

We conclude that each of Collins's arguments is without merit, largely for the reasons stated by the district court and magistrate judge in their multiple explanations. **AFFIRMED.**

The two motions that were carried with the case are **DENIED AS MOOT.**