Doc. 8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS FORT SMITH DIVISION

ALLEN BISHOP

PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANTS

v.

Case No. 2:15-CV-02009

LUKE UNKNOWN; and TAMMY UNKOWN

<u>O R D E R</u>

The Court has received proposed findings and recommendations (Doc. 4) from United States Magistrate Judge Mark E. Ford to which Plaintiff filed objections (Doc. 6). The Court has conducted a *de novo* review as to all specified proposed findings and recommendations to which Defendants have raised objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Court cannot discern from Plaintiff's objections any law or fact requiring departure from the Magistrate's report. Rather, the report of the magistrate appears to be well reasoned and the recommendation to be sound. This Court is a court of limited jurisdiction. Plaintiff's claims are rooted in state law; Plaintiff has not stated a federal claim; and federal diversity jurisdiction does not exist in this case. The Court is therefore without jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's claims.

Accordingly, the Court finds that the report and recommendation of the Magistrate is proper and should be and hereby is ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY. For the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is DENIED, and the Complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for lack of jurisdiction.

Judgment will be entered accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 14th day of April, 2015

<u>/s/P. K. Holmes, III</u>

P.K. HOLMES, III CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE