

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

MICHAEL A. DOYLE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Docket no. 2:23-cv-00139-GZS
)	
ANN MAKSYMOWICZ, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ON RECOMMENDED DECISION

On August 22, 2023, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 17), which recommended that the Court grant the pending motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 5, 9 & 13) and enjoin Plaintiff from filing new cases in the District of Maine without first obtaining court permission. Thereafter, this Court granted Plaintiff two extensions for file objection to the Recommended Decision, which resulted in an objection deadline of October 13, 2023. See ECF Nos. 19 & 21. In response to this deadline, Plaintiff sent a letter to the Court (ECF No. 22) on October 4, 2023, which the Court received and docketed on October 6, 2023, suggesting he needed until October 23, 2023, to finalize and file his objections.

On October 11, 2023, the Court received a 30-page filing from Plaintiff (ECF No. 23), which he described as “additional information . . . not available at the time the complaint was filed.” (Id., PageID # 156.) Given its timing, this filing was docketed as an Objection to the Recommended Decision.¹ On October 17, 2023, Defendant filed their respective responses (ECF Nos. 24-26) to Plaintiff’s October 11th filing.

¹ To the extent that this filing (ECF No. 23) could be alternatively construed as a pro se motion to amend the complaint, the Court DENIES that request as futile. The bulk of this filing is actually duplicative of Plaintiff’s initial Complaint (ECF No. 1). Two exhibits (ECF Nos. 23-1 & 23-2) are duplicates of exhibits submitted as ECF Nos. 10-1 & 10-2. The two new exhibits (ECF No. 23-4 & 23-5) offer no basis for concluding that Plaintiff can state a plausible claim against any of the named Defendants.

The Court has made a de novo determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision and concurs with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in that order. The Court determines that no further proceedings are necessary with respect to this Recommended Decision. To the extent that the Recommended Decision recommends that Mr. Doyle be subject to future filing restrictions, the Court finds that Mr. Doyle has received two prior Cok warnings and this case is his eighth case to be dismissed for failing to state a plausible claim. See Doyle v. Porter, No. 2:22-CV-00127-GZS, 2022 WL 3716245, at *4 & n.8 (D. Me. Aug. 29, 2022).

It is therefore **ORDERED** that:

1. The Recommended Decision (ECF No. 17) is hereby **AFFIRMED**.
2. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 5, 9 & 13) are hereby **GRANTED**.
3. The Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED**.
4. Michael Doyle is hereby **ENJOINED** from filing new cases in the District of Maine. If Mr. Doyle seeks to file any new complaint, he shall first file a motion for leave to file the pleading. The motion shall explain how the proposed pleading satisfies Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and shall attached the proposed pleading to be filed. A judge shall review the motion and determine whether leave to file can be granted. In the absence of a court order granting the motion for leave to file, the Clerk shall return any new pleadings received from Mr. Doyle.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ George Z. Singal
United States District Judge

Dated this 26th day of October, 2023.