

notice to the plaintiff. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). However, if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure to prove service, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. *Id.* In the instant action, the Court extended the time required for Plaintiff to file proof of proper service after finding good cause to do so and warned Plaintiff that her claims would be dismissed if proof of proper service was not filed. Plaintiff failed to file proof of proper service within the extended deadline. Therefore, the undersigned RECOMMENDS, that United States District Judge Reed O'Connor DISMISS Plaintiff's claims without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).

Plaintiff is cautioned that her claims could be barred by the statute of limitations should Judge O'Connor dismiss her claims. Plaintiff in her Complaint brings her claims pursuant to the Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1601, and the UCC. Plaintiff should be aware that claims brought under the Truth in Lending Act are subject to a one year statute of limitations. U.S.C. § 1640(e). Different statute of limitation periods may apply for Plaintiff's other claims, including but not limited to, claims under the UCC.

A copy of this findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual

findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

It is so **ORDERED** on July 5, 2017.



Hal R. Ray, Jr.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE