

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

CLEVELAND HANKERSON,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
PROBATION AND PAROLE,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:13-CV-78 (MTT)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Charles H. Weigle’s Recommendation (Doc. 19) on the Defendant’s motion to dismiss (Doc. 15). The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing the Petitioner’s request for a writ of mandamus (Doc. 1) because he has no right to the requested relief under either the Freedom of Information Act or the Privacy Act, the Defendant has no clear duty to act, and the Petitioner cannot show that no other adequate remedy is available. The Petitioner has objected to the Recommendation (Doc. 20), contending the Magistrate Judge misconstrued his request.

The Court has thoroughly considered the Petitioner’s objection and has made a de novo determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which the Petitioner objects. The Court accepts and adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. The Recommendation is **ADOPTED** and made the order of this Court. Accordingly, the Defendant’s motion to dismiss (Doc. 15) is **GRANTED**, and the petition for writ of mandamus is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED, this 7th day of February, 2014.

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