

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

DEANDRE BRADLEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 17-cv-0862-MJR-GCS
)	
JEFFERY DENNISON,)	
KAREN SMOOT,)	
A. DAVID,)	
JOHN BALDWIN,)	
and JONATHAN BOTARF,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

REAGAN, Chief Judge:

This is a prisoner civil rights lawsuit filed by Deandre Bradley who currently is incarcerated at Menard Correctional Center but complains of events occurring while he was confined at Shawnee Correctional Center. Bradley presents claims of deliberate indifference to his medical needs, unconstitutional conditions of confinement, and violation of the Rehabilitation Act and Americans with Disabilities Act. The operative complaint is Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, filed on December 6, 2018. Four Defendants answered that complaint on December 17, 2019 – Defendants Dennison, Smoot, Baldwin and Botarf. A fifth Defendant answered two days later – Defendant David (whose answer reveals his full name is Dr. Alfonso David).¹

Now before the Court is Defendant David’s April 9, 2018 motion for summary

¹ The Clerk’s Office shall correct the docket sheet to replace “A. David” with Dr. Alfonso David.

judgment (Doc. 49) based on Plaintiff's alleged failure to exhaust administrative remedies before filing this suit. Plaintiff timely opposed the motion, and the Magistrate Judge then assigned to the case (the Honorable Stephen C. Williams) held a hearing on the motion on December 4, 2018 and issued a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 96, R&R). The R&R recommends that the undersigned District Judge deny Defendant David's summary judgment motion and find that Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies against David "as to [Plaintiff's] foot and leg injury" (*id.*, p. 19).

Objections to the R&R were due December 27, 2018. Defendant David secured an extension of the objection deadline through February 1, 2019 (*see* Doc. 104). That deadline passed three days ago, with neither an objection nor another motion for extension of the deadline filed. Because no objection was lodged against the R&R, the undersigned need not conduct de novo review of the R&R. **28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(C) (A judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.);** *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 **ADOPTS** in its entirety Judge Williams' R&R (Doc. 96) and **DENIES** Defendant David's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 49).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED February 4, 2019.

s/Michael J. Reagan
Michael J. Reagan
United States District Judge