Mitchell v. Scott et al Doc. 41

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

ALBERT C. MITCHELL,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No. 17-CV-245-NJR-DGW
MICHAEL SCOTT,)
CHRISTINE BROWN,)
JACQUELINE LASHBROOK, and)
KAREN JAIMET,)
)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

ROSENSTENGEL, District Judge:

Plaintiff Albert Mitchell filed this *pro se* lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against various prison officials for denying him medical treatment while he was an inmate of the Illinois Department of Corrections housed at Pinckneyville Correctional Center (Doc. 1; Doc. 6).

The case is currently before the Court on a Report and Recommendation entered by Magistrate Judge Donald G. Wilkerson on August 16, 2018, in which he recommends dismissing this case with prejudice for lack of prosecution (Doc. 40). Mitchell failed to respond to Defendants' discovery requests and to Defendants' motion to compel (see Doc. 37). He also failed to respond to the Court's order to show cause as to why this matter should not be dismissed for want of prosecution (see Doc. 39). And he did not file an objection to Magistrate Judge Wilkerson's Report and Recommendation by the

deadline on September 4, 2018 (see Doc. 40). In fact, based on a review of the docket, it

appears the Court has not heard from Mitchell since he filed a notice of his change of

address in April 2017 following his release from prison (Doc. 22).

Because no party has filed an objection, the undersigned need not undertake

de novo review. 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.") (emphasis added). See also Thomas v. Arn,

474 U.S. 140 (1985); Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp., 170 F.3d 734, 741 (7th Cir. 1999);

Video Views, Inc. v. Studio 21, Ltd., 797 F.2d 538 (7th Cir. 1986).

The undersigned accordingly ADOPTS in its entirety Magistrate Judge

Wilkerson's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 40). This action is **DISMISSED** with

prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The Clerk of Court is

DIRECTED to enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 6, 2018

NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL **United States District Judge**

Navy J. Roensting

Page 2 of 2