


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

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AUGUSTA DIV.
2015 JAN -7 PM 3:59
CLERK 
SO. DIST. OF GA.


STEVE H. EZZARD,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) CV 314-141
)
 DR. AJIBADE and)
 WARDEN BRAD HOOKS,)
)
 Defendants.)

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. 25). Nothing in Plaintiff's objections undermines the Magistrate Judge's analysis that Plaintiff fails to satisfy the four prerequisites for obtaining injunctive relief. The Court also notes that Plaintiff's declaration in his objections that he has made the Magistrate Judge a Defendant is both procedurally and substantively improper. See Rehberg v. Paulk, 132 S. Ct. 1497, 1503 (2012) (listing "functions that are absolutely immune from liability for damages under § 1983," including "actions taken by judges within the legitimate scope of judicial authority"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 (explaining rules for filing a motion to amend). Therefore, Plaintiff's declaration does not change the fact that there are currently only two defendants in this case, and they are both listed in the caption above.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its opinion and **DENIES** Plaintiff's motions for an emergency injunction. (Doc. nos. 17, 19.)

SO ORDERED this 7th day of January, 2015, at Augusta, Georgia.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE