

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

**CARLOS RAY FRAZIER  
ADC #650936**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**No. 4:24-cv-00766-LPR**

**LAFAYETTE WOODS, JR., et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

The Court has reviewed the Recommended Disposition (RD) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Jerome T. Kearney (Doc. 11). No objections have been filed, and the time for doing so has expired. After a *de novo* review of the RD, along with careful consideration of 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.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, this action 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 and the accompanying Judgment would not be taken in good faith.<sup>2</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of January 2025.



\_\_\_\_\_  
LEE P. RUDOFSKY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> There is one exception. The Court declines to adopt Footnote 1 of the RD. It appears this footnote does not actually apply to the instant case.

<sup>2</sup> The information set out in Footnote 2 of the RD provides—on its own—sufficient grounds to dismiss this case without prejudice. It is unclear to me why the RD goes any further. But, at the end of the day, the RD's additional analysis is not wrong.