

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

MICKEL SHEPHERD,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 15-00373-KD-N
)	
STAN WILSON, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

After due and proper consideration of the issues raised, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 48) of the Magistrate Judge dated December 21, 2015, and made under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), and S.D. Ala. GenLR 72(a)(2)(S), is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of this Court.¹

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant Richard Stringer’s motion to strike (Doc. 42) is **DENIED**;
2. The Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (Docs. 7, 18, 26) are **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff Mickel Shepherd’s federal claims in his Complaint (Doc. 1);

¹ Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file objections, which the Court denied. (Docs. 49-50). The motion stated, “However, in the alternative, a Blanket OBJECTION is filed this date with this Court. The Plaintiff’s case is not Time Barred due to the fact the mistreatment by the Defendants existed up until the date this legal action was filed. The Amended Complaint should not be *Denied* because there are many legal theories which support the Plaintiff’s Complaint as Amended against all Defendants.” (Doc. 49 at 1 capitalizations and emphasis in original). “Parties filing objections to a magistrate’s report and recommendation must specifically identify those findings objected to. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections need not be considered by the district court.” *Marsden v. Moore*, 847 F.2d 1536, 1548 (11th Cir. 1988). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s “blanket objection” was not considered. *See also Green v. McNeil*, 2010 WL 3833967, at *1 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2010)(“address[ing] the R & R as if no objection was filed” when party filed a “blanket objection.”).

3. Shepherd's requests for leave to amend and to engage in discovery embedded in his response brief (Doc. 32 at 4-5) and his separate motion for leave to amend (Doc. 47) are **DENIED**; and
4. The Court declines to continue exercising supplemental jurisdiction over Shepherd's state law, county law, and Cooperative rules and by-laws claims in his Complaint (Doc. 1) and **DISMISSES** those claims **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Final judgment in accordance with this Order and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58 shall be entered by separate document.

DONE and **ORDERED** this **8th** day of **January 2016**.

/s/ Kristi K. DuBose
KRISTI K. DuBOSE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

