

**IN THE UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
JACKSON DIVISION**

**HAROLD J. BLAKELY**

**PLAINTIFF**

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11cv148-KS-MTP**

**STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's [18] Motion for Recusal, and the Court having considered the motion finds that it should be denied.

Plaintiff's motion expresses dissatisfaction with a ruling in this case, specifically an [12] Order entered January 6, 2012 that, in part, denied his request to amend his complaint. It appears that Plaintiff is still attempting to have this cause of action assigned to another judge.

Dissatisfaction with a court ruling is insufficient to support an allegation of bias or a basis for recusal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 or 455. *See United States v. MMR Corp.*, 954 F.2d 1040, 1045 (5th Cir. 1992) (“[A]dverse rulings in a case are not an adequate basis for demanding recusal.”) (citations omitted).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

Plaintiff's [18] Motion for Recusal is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED** this the 14th day of March, 2012.

s/Michael T. Parker  
United States Magistrate Judge