

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

ALLEN ALPHONZO ADAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-321(MTT)
)	
JUNE BISHOP, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Stephen Hyles. (Doc. 20). The Magistrate Judge, having reviewed the Plaintiff’s “Motion for Injunction (sic) Relief” (Doc. 10), “Motion for Preliminary Injunction Seeking a Hearing for TRO Injunction Pursuanting (sic) to Federal Rule 65” (Doc. 13), “Expedited Motion for Augment Records for TRO Injunction Proceedings” (Doc. 15), and “Motion for Injunction Relief for TRO” (Doc. 16), recommends denying the Motions. Regarding the Plaintiff’s Motions for a TRO or injunctive relief, the Recommendation concludes that the Plaintiff has not shown a substantial likelihood of success on the merits necessary to obtain this relief. The Recommendation also concludes that the Plaintiff’s requests are unrelated to his Complaint, and the Plaintiff has no constitutional right to be moved to another facility.

The Plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommendation.¹ (Doc. 24). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has thoroughly considered the Plaintiff's Objection and has made a de novo determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which the Plaintiff objects. The Recommendation is adopted and made the order of this Court. The Plaintiff's Motions are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this the 12th day of February, 2013.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ The Plaintiff also filed various motions related to the Recommendation and his Objection. (Docs. 25-27, 29). The Plaintiff then appealed the Recommendation prior to this Court entering a final order. The Eleventh Circuit dismissed the appeal because the Recommendation was not a final and appealable decision. (Doc. 64).