

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

SHAUN HENDERSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 15-cv-0529-MJR-RJD
)	
KIMBERLY BUTLER,)	
SALVADOR GODINEZ,)	
ALEX JONES,)	
BRANDON ANTHONY,)	
VICKI PAYNE,)	
SUE HILL,)	
C. FLEMING,)	
K. BROOKMAN,)	
C. SUMNER, and)	
J. SCHOENBECK,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

REAGAN, Chief District Judge:

In 2015, Plaintiff Shaun Henderson brought suit against several officials at the Menard Correctional Center, alleging that he was unlawfully held in segregation for two false disciplinary tickets in 2013 and one false disciplinary ticket in 2014. The case comes before the Court on Defendants’ motion for summary judgment due to Plaintiff’s failure to exhaust administrative remedies (Doc. 25) filed May 19, 2016, with a supporting memorandum (Doc. 26). Also before the Court are two motions by Plaintiff for injunctive relief (Docs. 38, 40) in which Plaintiff seeks a transfer from Menard and requests to have his family visitation rights reinstated. Magistrate Judge Reona J. Daly held an evidentiary hearing on the motion on February 2, 2017.

On February 22, 2017, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 636(b), Magistrate Judge Daly submitted a detailed Report & Recommendations (Doc. 52) to the undersigned Chief District Judge. According to the Report, Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies as to all of the defendants except for Defendant Fleming. The Report recommends that the undersigned grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Defendant Christopher Fleming and dismiss without prejudice Plaintiff's claims against Fleming. The Report recommends that the undersigned deny the motion as to Defendants Godinez, Butler, Jones, Payne, Sumner, Hill, Brookman, Anthony, and Shoenbeck. Finally, the Report recommends that Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief be denied. The docket entry associated with the Report and Recommendations clearly states that any objections to Judge Daly's findings and recommendations were due by March 8, 2017.

No objections were filed by that deadline, nor did either party move for additional time to file objections. Accordingly, this Court need not conduct a *de novo* review. *See* 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a **de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations to which objection is made.**"); Fed. Rule Civ. P. 72(b)(3) ("The district judge must determine **de novo** any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions").

The Court **ADOPTS** in its entirety Judge Williams' Report and Recommendation (Doc. 52) and **GRANTS** Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Defendant Christopher Fleming. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Fleming are **DISMISSED without prejudice**. The Court **DENIES** Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Defendants Godinez, Butler, Jones, Payne, Sumner, Hill, Brookman, Anthony, and Shoenbeck. Plaintiff's claims against these Defendants remain pending. The Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docs. 38, 40) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 10, 2017

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