

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

**CHRISTOS JAMES
STAVROPOULOS,**

Plaintiff,

v.

SHERIFF NEIL WARREN,

Defendant.

1:13-cv-3665-WSD

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Janet F. King’s Final Report and Recommendation [5] (“R&R”) recommending that this action be dismissed.

I. BACKGROUND

On November 5, 2013, Plaintiff Christos James Stavropoulos (“Plaintiff”), then an inmate at the Cobb County Adult Detention Center, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action alleging civil rights abuses. On November 13, 2013, Magistrate Judge King ordered Plaintiff, within thirty (30) days, to either pay the Court’s standard filing fee or submit an *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) application. Judge King’s order was mailed to the Plaintiff’s address of record, but was returned marked as “Not Deliverable as Addressed.”

On January 22, 2014, Judge King issued her R&R recommending that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Local Rule 41.2(C) because Plaintiff failed to notify the Court of his current address. No objection has been filed.¹

II. DISCUSSION

A. Legal Standard

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (Supp. V 2011); Williams v. Wainwright, 681 F.2d 732, 732 (11th Cir. 1982) (per curiam). A district judge "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If no party has objected to the report and recommendation, a court conducts only a plain error review of the record. United States v. Slay, 714 F.2d 1093, 1095 (11th Cir. 1983) (per curiam).

B. Analysis

As the Magistrate Judge noted in the R&R, the Court currently does not have any information about Plaintiff's address and does not have other contact

¹ The R&R was mailed to Plaintiff but returned to the Court as "not deliverable."

information for him. Plaintiff's failure to provide the Court with accurate contact information has delayed and adversely affected the management of this case, including because these proceedings cannot continue without being able to communicate with Plaintiff.

Local Rule 41.2(C) provides that

[t]he failure . . . of a party appearing *pro se* to keep the clerk's office informed of any change in address and/or telephone number which causes a delay or otherwise adversely affects the management of the case shall constitute grounds . . . for dismissal of the action without prejudice.


The Court does not find any error in the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Janet F. King's Final Report and Recommendation [5] is **ADOPTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** pursuant to Local Rule 41.2(C).

SO ORDERED this 31st day of March, 2014.



WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE