

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

**COREY K. JONES  
ADC #180289**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**Case No: 4:24-cv-00454-LPR**

**J. WEEKLY, et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

The Court has reviewed the Recommended Disposition (RD) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Joe J. Volpe (Doc. 5) and the Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 8).<sup>1</sup> After a *de novo* review of the RD, along with careful consideration of the Objections 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.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 2) is DISMISSED without prejudice. Plaintiff's pending motions are DENIED as moot.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. 10) and Notice (Doc. 14)—or any of the other documents filed after the RD—can be construed as lodging objections to the RD, the Court has considered them as such.

<sup>2</sup> These motions include Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. 10), Motion for Supporting Evidence (Doc. 11), Motion to Hold or Retrieve Computer Access (Doc. 12), Motion for Settlement (Doc. 13), Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 16), Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 17), and Motion to Amend Complaint (Doc. 18). Plaintiff's proposed amendments cannot remedy the failure to exhaust his administrative remedies prior to filing this lawsuit.