Hurlbut et al v. Burl et al

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS EASTERN DIVISION

DANIEL B. HURLBUT, ADC # 658898; DELWRICK COLEMAN, ADC # 656538; SAMSON TILLIS, ADC # 141221; HARRY SURBUR, ADC # 89794; JOSEPH SMITH, ADC # 127880; JAMES EVERETT, ADC # 109614; CHRISTOPHER BREWER, ADC # 652673; BEN MCCARTER, ADC # 128344; and PAUL BRANSON, ADC # 097273

PLAINTIFFS

v.

No. 2:13-cv-128-DPM-HDY

DANNY BURL; TODD BALL; DAVID MILLS; RAY HOBBS; LARRY MAY; JIM SMITH; WENDY KELLEY; RAYMOND NAYLOR; and JANET LEWIS

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

The Court has considered the objections to Magistrate Judge H. David Young's proposed findings and recommendations, $N_{\rm P}$ 16 & 17. On *de novo* review, the Court adopts Judge Young's proposal. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). Plaintiffs' complaint is dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiffs Coleman, Tillis, Surbur, Smith, Everett, Brewer, and Branson have not complied with the Court's Order to submit individual amended complaints by 4 November 2013 or risk dismissal, $N_{\rm P}$ 4 at 2. McCarter filed an amended complaint, $N_{\rm P}$ 15,

but fails to state a claim. Hurlbut filed a motion clarifying his claims, N
otin 7, but he, too, fails to state a claim. And Hurlbut now requests dismissal without prejudice, N
otin 18. Pending motions, N
otin 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, & 18, are denied as moot. The Court certifies that an *in forma pauperis* appeal from this Order and the related Judgment would not be taken in good faith.

So Ordered.

D.P. Marshall Jr.

United States District Judge

4 December 2013