

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

BRIAN MICHAEL WATERMAN, )

)

Plaintiff, )

)

v. )

Case No.: 18-3135-CM-KGG

)

BOARD OF COMM'RS OF )

COLUMBUS, KANAS, )

)

Defendant. )

)

\_\_\_\_\_)

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER**

Now before the Court is Plaintiff’s “Motion to Recuse.” (Doc. 141.) As discussed below, Plaintiff’s motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff has moved for recusal of the undersigned Magistrate Judge, alleging “extreme bias, prejudice, and being partial to the defendants.” (Doc. 141.) His complaints are based on the denial of several of his motions by the Magistrate Judge concerning alleged lack of access to legal material in jail, the appointment of counsel and an expert for this case, and other complaints against the jailers. (Docs. 90, 110, 126, 135, 139.)

While the Magistrate Judge acknowledges Plaintiff’s frustration, his complaints suggest no personal bias or prejudice on the part of the Magistrate Judge against the Plaintiff. Dissatisfaction concerning prior rulings does not

warrant case reassignment. Plaintiff is reminded that any ruling of this Magistrate Judge is appealable to the assigned District Judge under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) by serving and filing objections to the ruling within 14 days after being served with the ruling.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's "Motion to Have Envelopes Examined by an Expert and Counsel Appointed to Represent Plaintiff" (Doc. 141) is **DENIED** as more fully set forth above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019, at Wichita, Kansas.

s/ KENNETH G. GALE  
HON. KENNETH G. GALE  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE