

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

**DORLETHA LAMBERT
ADC #719450**

PLAINTIFF

v.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00023-LPR

**ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.**


DEFENDANTS

ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Recommended Disposition (RD) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Joe J. Volpe (Doc. 9), the Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 13), and the Plaintiff's Answer to Recommended Disposition (Doc. 14). After a *de novo* review of the RD, along with careful consideration of the Plaintiff's Objections, her Answer to the RD, and the entire case record, the Court hereby approves and adopts the RD in its entirety as this Court's findings and conclusions in all respects.¹

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 2) is DISMISSED without prejudice, and this case is CLOSED. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an *in forma pauperis* appeal from this Order or the accompanying Judgment would not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 8th day of July 2024.



LEE P. RUDOFSKY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Although it appears from later filings that Ms. Lambert may have fully exhausted her administrative remedies at this point, it is still apparent on the face of her Complaint that she failed to exhaust her claims prior to filing this case. See Compl. (Doc. 2) at 7, 12. The Court must therefore dismiss this case. *Johnson v. Jones*, 340 F.3d 624, 627 (8th Cir. 2003). The dismissal is without prejudice, however, which means Ms. Lambert may try to bring her claims in a new case if indeed she has now exhausted her administrative remedies and can fix the other deficiencies noted in the RD.