

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

ANTOINE DESHAW ODOM,

Plaintiff,

File No. 2:12-CV-374

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

DANIEL HINES, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On June 3, 2013, United States Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") recommending that Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (Dkt. No. 11) be denied. (Dkt. No. 25, R&R.) Plaintiff was notified that any objections must be filed within fourteen days of receipt of the R&R. On June 25, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time. (Dkt. No. 29.)

The Court may, for good cause, extend the time to act if a request is made before the original time expires, or, if the motion is made after the time has expired, a showing is made that the party failed to act because of excusable neglect. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). It is not clear what time period Plaintiff seeks to extend. If Plaintiff is requesting an extension of time to file objections to the R&R, the request is untimely. Plaintiff did not file his request for extension within the fourteen day time period for filing his objections, and Plaintiff has not

shown that he failed to make a timely request because of excusable neglect. Plaintiff has also failed to show good cause for extending the time for filing objections. The only reasons Plaintiff has given for an extension are his need to combine three other claims and his involvement in other legal matters. These reasons do not constitute good cause for extending the time period for filing objections.

If Plaintiff is requesting an extension of time to take some other action, Plaintiff is directed to renew his motion and to clarify the time period he is seeking to have extended.

Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the R&R, and the deadline for doing so has expired. The Court has reviewed the matter and concludes that the R&R correctly analyzes the issues and makes a sound recommendation. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the R&R (Dkt. No. 25) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for extension of time, construed as a motion to extend the time period for filing objections to the R&R, is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Dkt. No. 11) is **DENIED**.

Dated: June 26, 2013

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell
ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE