

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM E. BOWHALL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:10-CV-603-WKW [WO]
)	
CAPITOL-EMI RECORDS, INC., <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On October 27, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“Recommendation”).¹ (Doc. # 5.) Plaintiff William E. Bowhall responded by filing a Motion to Proceed in *Pro-Se* (Doc. # 6), which is construed liberally as an objection. The court has conducted a *de novo* review of all pleadings and documents in this action, including the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation and Mr. Bowhall’s objection. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Based upon that review, the court finds that the objection lacks merit and that the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation is correct. Accordingly, it is ORDERED as follows:

1. Mr. Bowhall’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. # 2) is GRANTED.
2. Mr. Bowhall’s objection (Doc. # 6) is OVERRULED.

¹ Mr. Bowhall has filed eight other civil actions in this court. *See Bowhall v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 2:10cv601-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. Office of James M. Deimen*, 2:10cv604-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. Howell High Sch. Bd. of Educ.*, No. 2:10cv605-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. Viacom, Inc.*, 2:10cv606-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. Dep’t of Defense*, No. 2:10cv607-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. NBC, Inc.*, 2:10cv608-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. Obama*, No. 2:10cv609-WKW (July 14, 2010); *Bowhall v. NAACP Beverly Hills*, No. 2:10cv679-WKW (Aug. 10, 2010).

3. The Magistrate Judge's Recommendation (Doc. # 5) is ADOPTED.

4. Mr. Bowhall's claims against Defendants are DISMISSED without prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii).

An appropriate final judgment will be entered.

DONE this 15th day of November, 2010.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE