

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

MIKEL HAMMONDS, # 177 646,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:15-CV-006-WKW
)	[WO]
WARDEN JONES, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On February 9, 2015, the Magistrate Judge filed a Recommendation (Doc. # 15) that Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. # 7) be denied. On February 17, 2015, Plaintiff Mikel Hammonds filed a motion (Doc. # 16) regarding his motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. # 7). Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 16) is construed as an Objection to the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation (Doc. # 15).

The court has conducted an independent and *de novo* review of those portions of the Recommendation to which objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In his Objection, Plaintiff complains that his motion for preliminary injunction should be granted because Defendants continue: (1) to open his legal mail; (2) to target Plaintiff in retaliation for filing this lawsuit; and (3) to place Plaintiff in extremely harsh conditions. Plaintiff's Objection is due to be overruled

because he does not provide any evidence in furtherance of his claims of constitutional and federal violations, nor does Plaintiff attempt to cure the deficiencies that the Magistrate Judge cited and elaborated upon in his Recommendation. Specifically, Plaintiff does not highlight any nexus between the injunction he seeks and the underlying claims alleged in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint, nor does he argue or demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits of the present lawsuit.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Objection (Doc. # 16) is OVERRULED.
2. The Recommendation (Doc. # 15) is ADOPTED.
3. The Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. # 7) is DENIED.
4. The case is referred to the Magistrate Judge for additional proceedings.

DONE this 25th day of February, 2015.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE