

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

JAMES STILE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:13-cv-00248-JAW
)	
SOMERSET COUNTY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER AFFIRMING THE ORDER OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On February 16, 2018, the United States Magistrate Judge issued an order, *Decision and Order on Pending Mot.* (ECF No. 496), in which he denied various motions by James Stile. *Mot. for Subpoena of Docs.* (ECF No. 430); *Mot. for Extension of Time for Pl. to Examine Video Exs. Recently Provided in Summ. J. Mot. as Said Videos Have Been Altered from the Original Format that was Provided in Disc.* (ECF No. 452); *Mot. to Amend Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 15 and Rule 19* (ECF No. 455); *Mot. to Reopen Disc. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d)* (ECF No. 461). Mr. Stile filed objections to the order on March 6, 2018. *Pl.'s Obj. to the Magistrate's Decision and Order Dated February 16, 2018* (ECF No. 505) (*Pl.'s Obj.*). Defendants, except Somerset County, Delong, Allen, Mayhew, Welch, Jacques, Plourd, and Kline, filed their response to Mr. Stile's objections on March 16, 2018. *Defs.' Resp. to Pl.'s Obj. to the Magistrate Judge's Decision and Order Dated February 16, 2018* (ECF No. 513). On March 20, 2018, Defendant David Allen responded to Mr. Stile's

objections. *Def. David Allen's Resp. to Pl.'s Obj. to Decision and Order* (ECF No. 521).

The Magistrate Judge's order is on a non-dispositive matter, therefore the Court reviews the order to determine whether it is either "contrary to law" or "clearly erroneous." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a). The Court determines that it is neither, and the Court need not elaborate on the Magistrate Judge's well-reasoned order.

The Court notes that in his objection, Mr. Stile's claims: (1) not to possess certain video exhibits; and (2) not to be able to view other video exhibits that he does possess, *Pl.'s Obj.* at 2-4, 7-8 (ECF No. 505). However, neither issue was the subject of the motions on which the Magistrate Judge ruled, leading to this order. The Magistrate Judge is addressing these issues on a parallel track, and in the Court's view, these issues are more efficiently resolved there. *See Order* (ECF No. 531); *Letter from Attorney Cassandra Shaffer* (ECF No. 533); *Letter from Attorney Kasia Park* (ECF No. 534).

1. It is therefore ORDERED that the Order of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 496) is hereby AFFIRMED.
2. It is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's Objection to the Magistrate's Decision and Order Dated February 16, 2018 (ECF No. 505) be and hereby is OVERRULED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ John A. Woodcock, Jr.
JOHN A. WOODCOCK, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 21st day of May, 2018