

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE

<b>KRISTIN A. KING,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 1:13-cv-00163-JDL</b>
	)	
<b>MAINE DEPARTMENT OF</b>	)	
<b>CORRECTIONS, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER ON DEFENDANT’S OBJECTION TO MEMORANDUM OF  
DECISION**

Plaintiff Kristin A. King has moved to amend the complaint in her employment discrimination suit against the Maine Department of Corrections, seeking to join David Garrison as a defendant and to add additional claims. *See* ECF No. 34. The Department of Corrections objected, ECF No. 36, and the motion was referred to Magistrate Judge John Nivison. On May 5, the Magistrate Judge entered a Memorandum of Decision granting King’s motion to amend. ECF No. 40. The Department of Corrections objected again. ECF No. 42.

A magistrate judge’s decision on a nondispositive pretrial matter is subject to correction by a judge of the district court only if it is “clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). *See also Pagano v. Frank*, 983 F.2d 343, 346 (1st Cir. 1993) (treating motion to amend as nondispositive). This deferential standard means a district court must accept a magistrate judge’s conclusions unless it has “a strong, unyielding belief that a mistake has been made.” *United States v. Stone*, 824 F. Supp. 2d 176, 185 (D. Me. 2011) (citing *Phinney v.*

*Wentworth Douglas Hosp.*, 199 F.3d 1, 4 (1st Cir. 1999)). After carefully reviewing the relevant materials, I have no such belief. The objection to the Memorandum of Decision is hereby **OVERRULED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/Jon D.Levy  
**United States District Judge**

Dated this 4th day of June, 2015.