In the United States District Court For the Southern District of Georgia Waycross Division

United States District Court

By cashell at 8:46 am, Mar 08, 2017

JOSHUA BRIAN RANDOLPH,

Plaintiff.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 5:17-cv-1

v.

*

TOM GRAMIAK; EDWINA JOHNSON; and CHAPLAIN FLYNN,

*

Defendants.

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Joshua Brian Randolph's ("Randolph") Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation dated January 5, 2017. Dkt. No. 5. Randolph objects to the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation that this Court dismiss his claims for abuse of judicial process.

Id. at p. 1. Plaintiff states that he erroneously reported on his Section 1983 form Complaint that he had never filed any lawsuits in state or federal court relating to the conditions of his imprisonment because he misunderstood the question. Id. at p. 2. Plaintiff further represents that he failed to answer the question correctly because he did not fully read the page on

which that question was located. Id. at pp. 2-3.

As the Magistrate Judge explained in the Report and Recommendation, "Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(c) permits a court to impose sanctions, including dismissal, for 'knowingly fil[ing] a pleading that contains false contentions." Dkt. No. 4, p. 4 (quoting Redmon v. Lake Cty. Sheriff's Office, 414 F. App'x 221, 225-26 (11th Cir. 2011) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c))). The Magistrate Judge further explained that "[e]ven where a prisoner has later provided an explanation for his lack of candor, the Court has generally rejected the proffered reason as unpersuasive." Dkt. No. 4, p. 5 (citing Redmon, 414 F. App'x at 226 ("The district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding that Plaintiff's explanation for his failure to disclose the Colorado lawsuit-that he misunderstood the form-did not excuse the misrepresentation and that dismissal was a proper sanction.")) Therefore, Randolph's explanation that he did not understand or properly read the form is insufficient to overcome his lack of candor.

Accordingly, the Court **OVERRULES** Randolph's Objections.

Dkt. No. 5. After an independent and *de novo* review of the entire record, the Court **CONCURS** with and **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, dkt. no. 4, as the opinion of the Court. Consequently, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's Complaint and **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to enter the

appropriate judgment of dismissal and to **CLOSE** this case. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff leave to appeal in forma pauperis.

SO ORDERED, this ______ day of _______, 2017.

LISA GODBEY WOOD, CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA