

ORIGINAL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AUGUSTA DIV.

DUBLIN DIVISION

2013 JAN -4 P 3:47

CLERK 
SO. DIST. OF GA.

RANDALL BINGHAM,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

JOSE MORALES, et al.,)

Defendants.)

CV 311-019

ORDER

After a careful, *de novo* review of the file, the Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which objections have been filed (doc. no. 94). On November 30, 2012, the Magistrate Judge recommended that Defendants' motion for summary judgment concerning Plaintiff's claims of deliberate indifference related to the prison barbershop and laundry service be granted, and that this case be closed. (See doc. no. 92.) Plaintiff devotes the majority of his objections to asserting – incorrectly – that he is entitled to a declaratory judgment that he not be required to shave using barbershop equipment, and otherwise simply restates the claims that the Magistrate Judge has already addressed or raises new claims that are not related to the instant case. (See generally id.) Critically, he does not offer any new information or evidence that warrants a deviation from the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Thus, Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED**. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

Therefore, Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (doc. no. 73), a final judgment shall be **ENTERED** in favor of Defendants, and this civil action is **CLOSED**.

SO ORDERED this 4th day of ~~December, 2012,~~ ^{January 2013,} at Augusta, Georgia.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE