

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>EVELYN COTE and ALFRED COTE,</b>	)
	)
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)
	)
<b>v.</b>	)
	)
<b>TOM HOPP, SARAH HOUSTON, SCOTT</b>	)
<b>COWSER, DAN LEEZER, JAMES</b>	)
<b>DROZDZ, BRIAN HUNTER, JANE DOE,</b>	)
<b>JOHN DOE,</b>	)
	)
<b>Defendants.</b>	)

**Case No. 09-01060**

**ORDER**

On June 24, 2011, a Report & Recommendation was filed by Magistrate Judge Byron G. Cudmore in the above captioned case. More than fourteen (14) days have elapsed since the filing of the Report & Recommendation, and no objections have been made. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988); and Video Views, Inc. v. Studio 21, Ltd., 797 F.2d 538, 539 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). As the parties failed to present timely objections, any such objections have been waived. Id.

The relevant procedural history is sufficiently set forth in the comprehensive Report & Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Suffice it to say that Plaintiff has brought this litigation alleging that Defendants made and are using and publishing a recording of allegedly defamatory comments made against Plaintiffs while Plaintiffs attempted to retrieve their son's car after their son was pulled over for a driving violation. Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Protective Order and/or Temporary Restraining Order/Permanent Injunction [#76] in order to prevent the dissemination of

the video recording made by Defendant Hopp. The Court concurs with the recommendation that Plaintiffs' Motion [#76] be denied for the following reasons: (1) Plaintiffs cannot meet the standard for good cause as required for a protective order; (2) Plaintiffs have already filed the allegedly sensitive material in their own documents with the Court, making it part of the public record; (3) the Illinois eavesdropping statute, 720 ILCS 5/14-2, does not apply; and (4) the defamation claim has already been dismissed in a previous order [#50].

Accordingly, the Court now adopts the Report & Recommendation [#88] of the Magistrate Judge in its entirety. Plaintiffs' Motion for Protective Order and/or Temporary Restraining Order/Permanent Injunction [#76] is DENIED. This matter is referred to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

ENTERED this 20th day of July, 2011.

s/Michael M. Mihm  
Michael M. Mihm  
United States District Judge