

motion for summary judgment. The Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge not recommending the Court grant his motion for summary judgment.¹ The Magistrate Judge set the dispositive motion deadline for January 14, 2016 (Doc. 60), but the Plaintiff did not file his motion for summary judgment until February 8, 2016. Where a motion for summary judgment is filed after the district court's deadline for dispositive motions, the district court may properly deny it as untimely. *Dedge v. Kendrick*, 849 F.2d 1398, 1398 (11th Cir. 1988); *T.H.E. Ins. Co. v. Cochran Motor Speedway*, 2010 WL 5351183, at *2 (M.D. Ga.). Therefore, the Court denies the Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 64) as untimely.

The Court has reviewed the Recommendation, and the Court adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. The Recommendation is **ADOPTED as modified** and made the Order of this Court. Accordingly, the Defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 61) and the Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 64) are **DENIED**. The Plaintiff's "Motion Requesting to be Moved to Safe Living Conditions" (Doc. 66) and "Motion for Access and/or Assistance to Law Library" (Doc. 65) are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 23rd day of May, 2016.

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

¹ The Plaintiff also emphasizes in his objection that his injuries were more than de minimis. (Doc. 69 at 1-2). This appears to be in response to the Defendant's argument that the Plaintiff may only recover nominal damages if he prevails. (Doc. 61-2 at 9). There is evidence that the Plaintiff may have suffered more than de minimis injuries. (Docs. 61-3 at 40:13-16, 54:4-10, 55:12-14, 58:8-10; 61-7 at 1-4; 61-11 at 2). Thus, the issues of liability and damages will be left to the jury.