Bailey v. Ingram et al Doc. 88

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY CENTRAL DIVISION (at Lexington)

DAVID WAYNE BAILEY,)
Plaintiff,	Civil Action No. 5:14-CV-279-CHB
v.	ORDER ADOPTING DECOMMENDED DISPOSITION ON
RANDY INGRAM, et al.,) RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION ON) MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY
Defendants.) JUDGMENT
ato at)

This matter is before the Court on the Recommended Disposition of United States

Magistrate Judge Edward Atkins [R. 87], addressing the Motions for Summary Judgment filed

by Defendants Kevin Bugg, Randy Ingram, and Don Bottom. [R. 84, R. 85] No objections were

filed.

Generally, this Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the recommended disposition to which objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no objections are made, this Court is not required to "review . . . a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard" *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 151 (1985). Parties who fail to object to a magistrate judge's recommended disposition are also barred from appealing a district court's order adopting that recommended disposition. *United States v. White*, 874 F.3d 490, 495 (6th Cir. 2017); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

Magistrate Judge Atkins' Recommended Disposition required objections to be filed within fourteen (14) days of being served a copy. [R. 87 at p. 8] The time to file objections has passed, and no party has filed any objections to the Recommended Disposition nor sought an

extension of time to do so. *See Id.*; Fed. R. Crim P. 59(b). Nevertheless, this Court has examined the record, and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Disposition.

Accordingly, and the Court being otherwise sufficiently advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

- 1. The Magistrate Judge's **Recommended Disposition** [**R. 87**] is **ADOPTED** as the Opinion of this Court.
- 2. The Motions for Summary Judgment filed by Defendants Bugg, Ingram, and Bottom [R. 84, R. 85] are GRANTED.
- 3. Plaintiff David Wayne Bailey's First Amendment retaliation claims asserted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Bugg, Ingram, and Bottom are **DISMISSED**.
- 4. This action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and **STICKEN** from the Court's active docket.
- Judgment in favor of the defendants will be entered contemporaneously with this
 Order.

This the 21st day of November, 2018.

CLARIA HORN BOOM,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF
KENTUCKY

cc: COR

Pro se Plaintiff