

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 9, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 25-10970
Summary Calendar

LUZ DE AMOR EYTALIS,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS, (TAR); WICHITA FALLS
ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS, (WFAR); PARAGON MLS
CONNECT, (MLS); NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
(NAR),

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 7:24-CV-147

Before DAVIS, JONES, and HO, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Luz de Amor Eytalis appeals the district court's dismissal of her Third Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim. She argues that the district court erred by

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-10970

dismissing her federal antitrust claims, abused its discretion by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her related state law claims, and erred in overruling her objections to the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge.

Eytalis has forfeited any challenge to the district court's determination that she cannot bring a claim under the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 14, by failing to brief the issue. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). The conclusory facts alleged in Eytalis's Third Amended Complaint are insufficient to state an antitrust injury, a necessary component of standing to bring a claim under the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. *See Rx Sols., Inc. v. Caremark, LLC*, 164 F.4th 436, 444 (5th Cir. 2026); *Harmon v. City of Arlington*, 16 F.4th 1159, 1162-63 (5th Cir. 2021).

Given that Eytalis's federal claims were properly dismissed, she has not shown that the district court abused its wide discretion by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her remaining state law claims. *See Noble v. White*, 996 F.2d 797, 799 (5th Cir. 1993); 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). Finally, in overruling Eytalis's objections to the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions, the district court stated that it had considered her objections and conducted a de novo review of the contested portions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); *Koetting v. Thompson*, 995 F.2d 37, 40 (5th Cir. 1993). The district court was not "required to reiterate the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge." *Koetting*, 995 F.3d at 40.

AFFIRMED.