

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

KENNITH McDOWELL, ROBERT *
MAULDING, LUTHER STRIPLING, *
RUDY KYLE, FRED DOLLAR, JAMES *
JOSLIN, JAMES MILNER, JOE ELLIS, *
DAVID ELLIS, DANIEL STRIPLING, and *
JANET STRIPLING, *

Plaintiffs, *

vs. *

No. 4:08-cv-03979-SWW-HDY

ELBERT PRICE, individually and as Trustee *
for these plans: Bud Price’s Excavating *
Service Inc. Profit-Sharing Plan, Bud Price’s *
Excavating Service, Inc. Retirement Plan, *
Price’s Utility Contractors, Inc. Retirement *
Plan and for six unnamed plans; MARY *
RUTH PRICE, individually and as Trustee *
for these plans: Bud Price’s Excavating *
Service, Inc. Profit-Sharing Plan, Bud Price’s *
Excavating Service, Inc. Retirement Plan, *
Price’s Utility Contractors, Inc. Retirement *
Plan and for six unnamed plans (Plans A-F); *
Bud Price’s Excavating Service, Inc. *
Profit-Sharing Plan; Price’s Utility Contractors, *
Inc. Retirement Plan; Bud Price’s Excavating *
Service, Inc. Retirement Plan; six unnamed *
plans (Plans A-F); Price’s Utility Contractors, *
Inc. as plan administrator for Price’s Utility *
Contractor’s Inc., Retirement Plan and up to *
six unnamed plans; Bud Price’s Excavating *
Service, Inc. as plan administrator of Bud *
Price’s Excavating Service, Inc. Profit- *
Sharing Plan, Bud Price’s Excavating Service, *
Inc. Retirement Plan, and up to six unnamed *
plans (A-F), *

Defendants. *

ORDER

Plaintiffs Kenneth McDowell, Robert Maulding, Luther Stripling, Rudy Kyle, Fred
Dollar, James Joslin, James Milner, Joe Ellis, David Ellis, Daniel Stripling, and Janet Stripling,

former employees or beneficiaries of former employees of defendants Bud Price's Excavating Service, Inc. and Price's Utility Contractors, Inc., bring this action pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. § 1001 *et seq.*, to have their benefits under certain profit sharing plans and defined benefit plans maintained by defendants determined and paid. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge H. David Young for further proceedings and recommendation.

The Court has received findings and a recommendation from Judge Young. After a careful review of the findings and recommendation (Document 522), the timely objections received thereto (Documents 528 and 529), and a de novo review of the relevant portions of the record, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court concludes that the findings and recommendation should be, and hereby are, approved and adopted in their entirety as this Court's findings in all respects. The plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration (Document 461) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 10th day of April 2012.

/s/Susan Webber Wright
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE