

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

MITCHELL LAVERN LUDY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:14-CV-73 (MTT)
)	
CYNTHIA NELSON, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Charles H. Weigle. (Doc. 43). The Magistrate Judge recommends denying the Plaintiff’s motion regarding transfer to a different prison in retaliation for filing a lawsuit (Doc. 24), motion requesting a temporary restraining order against Johnson State Prison officials who have allegedly removed his medical profiles (Doc. 32), and motion requesting that the Court order Johnson State Prison officials to stamp his legal mail upon arrival (Doc. 39) because the Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding these claims. The Magistrate Judge also recommends denying the Plaintiff’s motion seeking a preliminary injunction to return his anointing oil (Doc. 25) because he has not shown that he meets the criteria for a preliminary injunction.

The Plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommendation.¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has considered the Plaintiff's objections and has made a de novo determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which the Plaintiff objects. In his objection, the Plaintiff does not contest that he failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding the first three motions nor does the Plaintiff attempt to show he meets the criteria for a preliminary injunction requiring the return of his anointing oil. The Court has reviewed the Recommendation, and the Recommendation is adopted and made the order of this Court. The Plaintiff's motions (Docs. 24, 25, 32, 39) are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this the 10th day of June, 2014.

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

¹ The Plaintiff has also filed a motion requesting a contempt order against the Defendants for their failure to respond to some of his motions (Doc. 56). However, this document primarily sets forth additional objections to the Recommendation. Accordingly, the Court construes it as an objection. To the extent the Plaintiff does seek to hold the Defendants in contempt for their failure to file responses, that motion is **DENIED**.