

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

CHRISTOPHER CROOM,

Plaintiff,

v.

**JACQUELINE LASHBROOK,
RODELY and JOHN BALDWIN,**

Defendants.

No. 17-cv-0633-DRH

MEMORANDUM and ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

On June 9, 2017, plaintiff Christopher Croom brought this *pro se* action for deprivations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 at the Menard Correctional Center (Doc. 1). On June 30, 2017, the Court screened Croom's amended complaint (Doc. 10) and construed it as a claim against defendants Counselor Rodely and Jacqueline Lashbrook on an Eighth Amendment claim of deliberate indifference as defendants failed to protect Croom from his enemy, Marlon Brown, by failing to respond to his emergency grievance (Doc. 13). In addition to filing the amend complaint, Croom filed the motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. 11).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Magistrate Judge Daly submitted a Report and Recommendation ("the Report") on October 3, 2017 (Doc. 26). The Report recommends that the Court deny Croom's motion for preliminary

injunction. Magistrate Judge Daly held an evidentiary hearing on the motion on August 8, 2017. The Report found that Croom has not established irreparable harm. Specifically, the Report found: “To date, the contact between Plaintiff and Marlon Brown has been minimal. ... Plaintiff has not established that he is likely to succeed on the merits because he has not established a substantial risk of serious harm.” (Doc. 26, pg. 4). 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 (Doc. 26). The Court **DENIES** Croom’s motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. 11) for the reasons given in the Report and Recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


Digitally signed by
Judge David R. Herndon
Date: 2017.10.24
13:52:42 -05'00'

United States District Judge