

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHEASTERN DIVISION**

DEXTER HARRIS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 5:22-cv-00500-LSC-SGC
)	
CHARLES HOOPER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The *pro se* plaintiff, Dexter Harris, asserts an Eighth Amendment claim via 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for deliberate indifference against Charles Hooper, CRNP, alleging denial of medical care at Limestone Correctional Facility. More specifically, Harris’s claim concerns the diagnosis and treatment—or supposed lack thereof—of problems with his right hand. The magistrate judge entered a report on February 27, 2024, recommending the court grant the defendant’s construed motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 31). Harris has filed objections to the report and recommendation. (Doc. 32).

Harris’s objections, which do not take issue with the magistrate judge’s factual findings,¹ reinforce the dispositive conclusion in the report and

¹ Indeed, much of Harris’s objections are devoted to summarizing the facts recited in the report. (Doc. 32 at 2-5). It appears when Harris mailed his objections to the court, he neglected to include the second page of his objections. (*See id.* at 1-2). In any event, the Clerk of Court has confirmed that all of the pages included in Harris’s mailing have been entered into the record.

recommendation: that Harris's claims amount to his disagreement with the medical treatment he received at Limestone. (See Doc. 32 at 6-8). Mere differences of opinion are insufficient to show deliberate indifference. *E.g. Keohane v. Fla. Dep't of Corr. Sec'y*, 952 F.3d 1257, 1265-66 (11th Cir. 2020). While the plaintiff casts the magistrate judge's determination as an improper credibility finding, her conclusion is the natural and necessary result of the facts set out in the report and recommendation—facts which Harris has adopted and incorporated into his objections. Similarly, Harris's continued insistence that he be evaluated by an independent medical provider supports the conclusion that his claim here is based on his disagreement with the treatment he has received. (Doc. 32 at 6).

For the foregoing reasons, Harris's objections are **OVERRULED**. (Doc. 32) After careful consideration of the entire record in this case, including the magistrate judge's report and the objections thereto, the court **ADOPTS** the report and **ACCEPTS** the recommendation. (Doc. 31). Consistent with that recommendation, the defendant's motion for summary judgment will be granted and all claims in this matter will be dismissed with prejudice.

DONE and ORDERED on March 26, 2024.



L. Scott Coddler
United States District Judge

160704