

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

ROBERT KENT,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNNAMED,

Defendant.

1:15-cv-2010-WSD

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Alan J. Baverman's Final Report and Recommendation [2] ("R&R"). The R&R recommends that this action be administratively closed.

I. BACKGROUND

On June 1, 2015, Plaintiff Robert Kent ("Plaintiff") submitted a letter to the Court, which the Clerk docketed as a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ([1]). Plaintiff did not pay a filing fee for this case or seek leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

Plaintiff seeks assistance in contacting his parents in Massachusetts and prison officials in Texas, and also requests that he be placed in the custody of the United States Marshals Service.

On June 15, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued his R&R. The Magistrate noted that the Court does not provide legal assistance or advice to litigants, and stated that if Plaintiff seeks to challenge any aspect of his current confinement, he may file a case in an appropriate Texas state or federal court. (R&R at 2). The Magistrate Judge determined that Plaintiff's letter to the Court does not articulate a clear claim for relief, and thus it is not in the interest of justice to transfer this action to a Texas federal court. (Id.). He concluded that this action should be administratively closed. (Id.).

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); 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). Where, as here, 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

The Magistrate Judge determined that Plaintiff's letter to the Court does not articulate a clear claim for relief, and thus it is not in the interest of justice to transfer this action to a Texas federal court. (R&R at 2 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a))). The Court finds no plain error in the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation. See Slay, 714 F.2d at 1095.


III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Alan J. Baverman's Final Report and Recommendation [2] is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSED**.

SO ORDERED this 29th day of March, 2016.



WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE