

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

CHRISTOPHER M. BURTON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 14-0427-MJR-SCW
	)	
HEAD WARDEN ROCKMON,	)	
RANDY VALDEZ, and	)	
MIKE SANDERS,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER**

**REAGAN, Chief Judge:**

On April 11, 2014, Plaintiff Christopher Burton, while incarcerated at Stateville Correction Center, commenced this civil rights action (Doc. 1). A threshold review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A was conducted on May 2, 2015 (Doc. 7), in which the Court noted the Plaintiff’s continuing obligation to inform the Court of his address (*Id.* at 7), which the Plaintiff has not done. Defendants have attempted to engage the Plaintiff in discovery by sending correspondence to his last known address, and have had no success. Defendants noticed up the Plaintiff’s deposition, and the Plaintiff failed to appear or otherwise respond (Docs. 27-1 and 27-2).

On July 27, 2015, the Defendants filed a motion for sanctions (Doc. 27), which received no response. The Honorable Stephen C. Williams, United States Magistrate

Judge, held a hearing on August 12, 2015 to hear argument on the motion; the Plaintiff did not appear (Doc. 29).

Now before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) submitted by Judge Williams on August 12, 2015 (Doc. 30), detailing the above series of facts, noting that the Plaintiff has had ample opportunity to prosecute the case, but has filed nothing with the Court since the date of his initial filing. It further specifically warned that continued neglect of the lawsuit could result in dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) (*Id.* at 3). Finally, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the undersigned grant the Defendants’ motion for sanctions and dismiss the Plaintiff’s case with prejudice (*Id.*). The parties had until August 31, 2015 to object to the R&R, and that deadline has elapsed. No party filed any objections or requested an extension of the objection-filing deadline.

Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the undersigned District Judge need not conduct *de novo* review of the R&R. **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)** (“**A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.**”). *See also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 741 (7th Cir. 1999); *Video Views Inc., v. Studio 21, Ltd.*, 797 F.2d 538 (7th Cir. 1986).

The Court hereby **ADOPTS** the R&R (Doc. 30) in its entirety, **GRANTS** the Defendants’ motion for sanctions, and **DISMISSES** the Plaintiff case **with prejudice**.

All settings related to this matter are hereby **CANCELLED**, including the November 7, 2016 jury trial. The Clerk of Court **SHALL** enter judgment accordingly.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: **September 14, 2015**

***s/ Michael J. Reagan***  
Michael J. Reagan  
Chief Judge  
United States District Court