

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

ADELIN E. RICHARDS,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL No. 1:11-cv-446-DBH
)	
CITY OF BANGOR, MAINE,)	
)	
DEFENDANT)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING RECOMMENDED DECISION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On December 11, 2012, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the court, with copies to the parties, her Recommended Decision on the defendant’s motion for summary judgment. The Magistrate Judge attached this Notice to the Recommended Decision:

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge’s report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within fourteen (14) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within fourteen (14) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court’s order.

Recommended Decision at 15 (ECF No. 44).

On December 28, 2012, the plaintiff filed her “objects for re (42) Motion Summary Judgment filed by CITY of BANGOR, MAINE” (ECF No. 45). Nowhere in that filing does she point to anything in the Recommended Decision to which

she objects. Instead, the document appears to be a very late attempt to respond to the original motion for summary judgment.

Because there is no objection to the Recommended Decision, the Recommended Decision is **ADOPTED**. The motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**. Judgment is entered for the defendant.

The defendant's motion to strike is **MOOT**. I need not resolve whether the plaintiff's "objects for re (42) Motion Summary Judgment" (ECF No. 45) meets the Rules requirement for a response to the original summary judgment motion.

SO ORDERED.

DATED THIS 19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2013

/s/D. BROCK HORNBY
D. BROCK HORNBY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE