

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

WILLIAM E. BOWHALL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:10-CV-605-WKW [WO]
)	
HOWELL HIGH SCHOOL BOARD)	
OF EDUCATION, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION

On September 24, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation in this case. (Doc. # 4.) On October 6, 2010, Plaintiff William E. Bowhall¹ filed a Motion to Proceed - In Pro-Se, which after review, the court construes as an objection. (Doc. # 5.) The court has conducted a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff's objection is an exercise in handwriting, and not much else. The court does find one well-articulated but mysterious line objecting to the Magistrate Judge's finding with respect to the statute of limitations: "Where do the statute of limitations begin, or end in a multi-issue, conspiratory atmosphere of non-conjecture?" (Def.'s Objection 6.) The Magistrate Judge correctly answered Mr. Bowhall's question with his conclusion that Mr. Bowhall's claims are wholly time-barred. Mr. Bowhall's complains of actions from 1974

¹ Mr. Bowhall apparently celebrated Bastille Day (July 14, 2010) by exercising his right to be litigious. Mr. Bowhall filed eight lawsuits, including the one herein referenced.

until his “exile to the State of Alabama in 1998.” (Compl. 5.) Mr. Bowhall’s various claims, all of them at least twelve years old, are stale under every applicable statute of limitations. Mr. Bowhall’s contention that he was not aware of the law until obtaining a primer book and reading it at Lowe’s in 2009 is irrelevant. No authority has been cited, and the court is aware of none, establishing that ignorance of the law is grounds for tolling the statute of limitations.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiff’s Objection (Doc. # 5) is OVERRULED;
2. The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. # 4) is ADOPTED;
3. Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. # 2) is GRANTED;
4. Plaintiff’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 judgment will be entered.

DONE this 27th day of October, 2010.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE