Elmore v. King Doc. 6

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

JEFFREY ELMORE ADC #091418 **PLAINTIFF**

v.

No. 4:24-cv-00923-LPR

ASHLEY KING, Grievance Coordinator, Cummins Unit

DEFENDANT

<u>ORDER</u>

The Court has reviewed the Recommended Disposition (RD) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Jerome T. Kearney (Doc. 5). 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.¹

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 and the accompanying Judgment would not be taken in good faith.

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

LEE P. RUDOFSKY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ It is also worth noting that the only relief sought by Plaintiff—Defendant's resignation and a requirement that the Grievance Coordinator must be "independent" of the ADC—is not relief that the Court has the power to give. *See* Compl. (Doc. 2) at 5.