MCCURDY v. SMITH et al Doc. 23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MAINE

MARK MCCURDY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)) 1:13-c	ev-00277-JAW
DONALD SMITH, et al.,)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND ORDER ON MOTION TO STAY

The United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court on December 31, 2013 his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 18). Mr. McCurdy filed his objections to the Recommended Decision on January 16, 2014 (ECF No. 19) and the Defendants filed their response to the objections on January 20, 2014 (ECF No. 22). Mr. McCurdy also moved to stay proceedings on January 16, 2014 (ECF No. 20); the Defendants opposed that motion on January 20, 2014 (ECF No. 21). I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary. Furthermore, Mr. McCurdy's assertion of "judicial economy" in support of his motion to stay lacks merit.

- 1. It is therefore <u>ORDERED</u> that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby <u>AFFIRMED</u>.
- 2. It is further <u>ORDERED</u> that the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 12) be and hereby is <u>GRANTED</u>.
- 3. It is further $\underline{ORDERED}$ that the Plaintiff's Motion to Stay (ECF No. 20) be and hereby is \underline{DENIED} .

SO ORDERED.

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

Dated this 19th day of February, 2014