

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CURTIS O. JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:13-cv-475

v

HON. JANET T. NEFF

F. HOGLE, et al.,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order against Defendants Hogle, Huss, and Nevins (Dkt 4), which was referred to the Magistrate Judge. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order against Defendants. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies the objections and issues this Opinion and Order.

Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge's analysis of his motion, arguing that he suffered irreparable injury when Defendants Hogle and Nevins precluded Plaintiff from participating in video conferences in two other cases (Objs., Dkt 36 at 2-3). Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that "his cell has been searched at least twice a day with correctional officers confiscating his legal documents

for the benefit of defendants Hogle and Nevins” (*id.* at 4). Last, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have threatened to “do physical harm to Plaintiff” (*id.*).

Plaintiff’s objections fail to demonstrate that a result other than the denial recommended by the Magistrate Judge is warranted. The Magistrate Judge correctly analyzed Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and fully considered his allegations. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff fails to establish that he is likely to prevail in this matter, that he would suffer irreparable injury absent injunctive relief, or that public interest would be served by judicial interference in the operations of the correctional facility in this case (R&R, Dkt 34 at 2). Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. Therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Objections (Dkt 36) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation (Dkt 34) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Dkt 4) is DENIED for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

Dated: February 18, 2014

/s/ Janet T. Neff _____
JANET T. NEFF
United States District Judge