Dunahue v. Bolden et al Doc. 78

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS PINE BLUFF DIVISION

REGINALD DUNAHUE ADC #106911 **PLAINTIFF**

v.

CASE NO. 5:16-CV-00105 BSM

KENNIE BOLDEN, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

The partial recommended disposition ("PRD") submitted by U.S. Magistrate Judge J. Thomas Ray [Doc. No. 75] and plaintiff Reginald Dunahue's objections [Doc. Nos. 76, 77] have been reviewed. After reviewing the record, the PRD is adopted. Accordingly, Dunahue's motions for a preliminary injunction [Doc. No. 33] and for summary judgment [Doc. No. 61] are denied.

Dunahue's objections also request review of Judge Ray's prior decisions. *See* Doc. No. 76 at 1. Dunahue requested multiple forms of relief in the same motion: (1) to strike defendant Kennie Bolden's answers to interrogatories; (2) to compel defendant Sedrick Foote to respond; (3) for sanctions; (4) and for a cease and desist order. *See* Doc. No. 57. Judge Ray granted the motion to strike and ordered Foote to respond. *See* Doc. No. 74. There is no need to revisit the decision because sanctions were not appropriate. While the fourth request was not addressed, there is no need to revisit it because the PRD addresses the request within the context of the motion for an injunction that was denied today.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 21st day of October 2016.

Zian & nile UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE