

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
District of Maine**

<p>STEVEN NELSON,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Plaintiff</p> <p>v.</p> <p>FORMED FIBER TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Defendant</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>No. 2:10-cv-473-GZS</p>
---	--	-----------------------------------

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

The United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court on January 13, 2012, his Recommended Decision (Docket No. 58). Plaintiff filed his Objection to the Recommended Decision (Docket No. 61) on January 26, 2012, together with a Motion for Oral Argument on his Objection to the Recommended Decision (Docket No. 62) filed on the same date. Defendant filed its Opposition to Plaintiff’s Objection to the Recommended Decision and his Motion for Oral Argument (Docket No. 74) on February 13, 2012.

I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a de novo determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

1. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

2. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Strike Jury Demand (Docket No. 16) is **GRANTED** and that Plaintiff's Jury Demand is **STRICKEN** from his complaint.
3. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Oral Argument on his Objection to the Recommended Decision (Docket No. 62) is **DENIED**.

/s/George Z. Singal

U.S. District Judge

Dated this 13th day of April, 2012.