

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>ALISA CAREY,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>1:22-cv-00332-JDL</b>
	)	
<b>CAPTAIN SLANEY, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Alisa Carey, who is proceeding pro se, brought this action in October 2022 against a number of Defendants, including, among others, members of the judiciary, mental health professionals, and a law enforcement official (ECF No. 2).<sup>1</sup> Carey asserts a variety of constitutional arguments, including, among other things, that the Defendants interfered with her right to access the courts and that the Defendants permitted a law enforcement officer to enter her prison cell where, she claims, he assaulted her.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e)(2) (West 2022), United States Magistrate Judge John C. Nivison conducted a preliminary review of Carey’s Complaint and filed his Recommended Decision on the Complaint with the Court on November 30, 2022 (ECF No. 8), pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2022) and Fed. R. Civ. P.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carey originally filed her Complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Chief Judge Swain later transferred the matter to this Court because all of the named Defendants are located in Maine and the alleged events giving rise to Carey’s claims took place in Maine. See 28 U.S.C.A. § 1406(a) (West 2022).

72(b). The time within which to file objections has expired, and no objections have been filed. The Magistrate Judge provided notice that a party's failure to object would waive the right to *de novo* review and appeal.

Notwithstanding Carey's failure to object, I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, and I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.<sup>2</sup>

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 8) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ACCEPTED** and Carey's Complaint (ECF No. 2) is **DISMISSED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated this 20th day of January, 2023.**

/s/ Jon D. Levy  
**CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE**

---

<sup>2</sup> To the extent that Carey's filings contain allegations that are not expressly addressed by the Recommended Decision, I conclude that she has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted as to those allegations because she has not pleaded sufficient factual matter that, accepted as true, would state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. *See Tuck v. City of Gardiner Police Dep't*, 1:18-cv-00212-JDL, 2019 WL 615356, at \*1 (D. Me. Feb. 13, 2019) (citing *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)).