

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

---

|                                      |   |                            |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>NATHAN E. DOSS,</b>               | ) |                            |
|                                      | ) |                            |
| <b>Plaintiff,</b>                    | ) |                            |
| <b>v.</b>                            | ) | <b>Case No. 15-CV-2287</b> |
|                                      | ) |                            |
| <b>KENCO LOGISTIC SERVICES, LLC,</b> | ) |                            |
| <b>et al.,</b>                       | ) |                            |
|                                      | ) |                            |
| <b>Defendants.</b>                   | ) |                            |

**ORDER**

A Report and Recommendation (#88) was filed by the Magistrate Judge in the above cause on July 6, 2017. More than fourteen (14) days have elapsed since the filing of the Recommendation and no objections have been made.<sup>1</sup> See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is, therefore, accepted by the court. See Video Views, Inc. v. Studio 21, Ltd, 797 F.2d 538 (7th Cir. 1986).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Plaintiff called the clerk’s office on July 18, 2017, and claimed he had received nothing in his case since the text order of May 9, 2017. The court finds such a claim to be incredible, since Plaintiff has repeatedly confirmed that the address on file with the court is his correct address, and the court has certified that all court orders have been sent to Plaintiff at that address. Further, Plaintiff’s claim would mean that, not only is he not getting mail from the court, but that he is not getting mail from Defendants either (including the Renewed Motion for Rule 37 Sanctions (#87)), even though Defendants certified that they mailed a copy of the motion to Plaintiff at the address he provided.

The court would further note that Magistrate Judge Eric Long has warned Plaintiff in the past that he must participate in this case. Judge Long, in an Order to Show Cause (#72) from January 11, 2017, wrote that he found “troubling” Plaintiff’s participation, “or lack thereof,” in this case, based on Plaintiff failing to appear at status conferences, whether in person or via telephone. Judge Long also noted Plaintiff’s failure to comply with discovery. Plaintiff was also aware of the earlier motion for sanctions that had been filed against him, and that a Report and Recommendation (#82) had been entered by Judge Long recommending Plaintiff be sanctioned. Plaintiff filed an Objection (#85) to that R&R. Plaintiff was thus well aware of how important it was, and how it was his responsibility, to stay in touch with the court and opposing parties in this case. See also Plaintiff’s history in this case as documented in the Report and Recommendation (#88).

In any event, Plaintiff called this court on July 18, 2017, and the clerk indicated and read to Plaintiff the docket entries entered since May 9, 2017. The clerk confirmed Plaintiff’s given address was correct, and, at Plaintiff’s request, mailed the documents to him. It is now July 25, 2017, a week later, and no objection has been filed, nor has any motion for an extension of time to file an objection been filed.

(1) The Report and Recommendation (#88) is accepted by this court. Defendants' Renewed Motion for Rule 37 Sanctions (#87) should be GRANTED.

(2) This case is dismissed in full as a sanction for Plaintiff's failure to comply with multiple court orders.

(3) This case is terminated.

ENTERED this 25<sup>th</sup> day July, 2017.

s/ COLIN S. BRUCE  
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE