Young v. Lee et al Doc. 9

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

ODRELL YOUNG ADC #150574 **PLAINTIFF**

v.

No. 4:23-CV-00329-LPR

EUGENE LEE, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Recommended Disposition (RD) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Patricia S. Harris.¹ No objections have been filed, and the time for doing so has expired.² After a *de novo* review of the RD, along with careful consideration of the case record, the Court hereby approves and adopts the RD in its entirety as this Court's findings and conclusions in all respects.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 2) is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The Court recommends that dismissal of this case count as a "strike," in the future, for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). 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 5th day of February 2024.

LEE P. RUDOFSKY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Doc. 7.

² It appears the RD was returned as undeliverable because the Plaintiff is no longer at the Barbara Ester Unit. *See* Doc. 8. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to update his address. Local Rule 5.5(c)(2). However, out of an abundance of caution, the Court will give Plaintiff 30 days to update his address with the Court and file objections to the RD. Plaintiff must file any such objections in the form of a Motion to Reconsider this Order of dismissal and the corresponding Judgment. If Plaintiff does file such a Motion, the Court will reconsider *de novo* any part of the RD that is properly objected to and evaluate whether this case should be re-opened.