Hellstrom v. Bishop et al Doc. 40

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
CENTRAL DIVISION at **LEXINGTON**

LEIF ERIC HELLSTROM,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. 06-CV-271-JMH
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
RON BISHOP, ET AL.,	)	**MEMORANDUM OPINION**
	)	**AND ORDER**
Defendants.	)	

***** ***** ***** *****

Plaintiff Leif Eric Hellstrom filed a *pro se* civil rights action [R. 1] to which the Defendants filed an Answer. [R. 29] On June 5, 2009, the Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. [R. 37] On June 8, 2009, the Court entered an Order [R. 39] directing the Plaintiff to file a response in opposition to the motion within 20 days, and cautioned him that his failure to do so constituted grounds for granting the motion.

The time permitted for Plaintiff to file a response in opposition to the motion to dismiss his Complaint has come and gone, and Plaintiff has not responded in any way. Accordingly, the Plaintiff has conclusively waived any opposition to the motion, and it must be granted. LR 7.1 (c)(1); *Resnick v. Patton*, 2007 WL 4532815, **1 n.1 (6th Cir. 2007).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [R. 37] is **GRANTED**.

2. Plaintiff's Complaint [R. 2] is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.**

3. This is a **FINAL AND APPEALABLE ORDER**.

4. The Court certifies that any appeal would not be taken in

Dockets.Justia.com

good faith. 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3); *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610-11 (6th Cir. 1997).

This the 7th day of July, 2009.

Signed By:

Joseph M. Hood

Senior U.S. District Judge