

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

STEVIE JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARK AARON, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 17-cv-420-DRH

MEMORANDUM and ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), on a Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) submitted by Magistrate Judge Williams on August 7, 2018 (Doc. 63). The Report recommends that the Court grant an oral motion to dismiss with prejudice plaintiff’s case for failure to prosecute (Doc. 61). Specifically, the Report found:

Here, Plaintiff has failed to file a response to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and failed to file anything with this Court since filing his notice of change of address and motion for extension of time to respond to the summary judgment motion (Docs. 51 and 52). At the time the Court reviewed his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, Plaintiff was informed that he was under a continuing obligation to update the Court on his current location (Doc. 20, p. 42). Plaintiff was reminded that he was to inform the Court of any change in his address within seven (7) days and failure to update the Court would result in dismissal of his claims (*Id.*). Although Plaintiff informed the Court of his change of address, subsequent filings sent to Plaintiff were returned undeliverable. Further, Plaintiff failed to appear at the status conference after being warned that the failing to do so would result in the dismissal of his claims. Plaintiff also failed to respond to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. As such, it appears that Plaintiff no

longer wishes to pursue his claims as he failed to participate in the case.
(Doc. 63, p. 3).

The Report was sent to the parties with a notice informing them of their right to appeal by way of filing “objections” within 14 days of service of the Report. To date, none of the parties has filed objections. The period in which to file objections has expired. Therefore, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), this Court need not conduct *de novo* review. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-52 (1985).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report in its entirety (Doc. 63). The Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ oral motion to dismiss with prejudice this matter for failure to prosecute (Doc. 61). Further, the Court **DENIES as moot** the summary judgment motion (Doc. 47). Lastly, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of the Court to enter judgment reflecting the same.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Judge Herndon
2018.08.27 11:35:45
-05'00'
United States District Judge