

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ABDULRAZAK BATUN,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
OMAHA HOUSING AUTHORITY,)
CLIFFORD SCOTT, and CINDY)
COSENTINO,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

8:14CV217

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation (Filing [50](#)) that this case be dismissed for failure to prosecute this matter with reasonable diligence, including failure to serve mandatory disclosures, to respond to Defendants’ discovery, and to respond to the court’s order to serve his mandatory disclosures and respond to Defendants’ discovery requests by October 5, 2015, or this case would be subject to dismissal “as a discovery sanction or for want of prosecution.” No objections to such Recommendation have been filed, as allowed by [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(C\)](#) and [NECivR 72.2](#).

I have reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#) and [NECivR 72.2](#), and I find after de novo review that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation should be adopted, and this action should be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to [Fed. R. Civ. P. 41](#) and [NECivR 41.2](#) (“At any time, a case not being prosecuted with reasonable diligence may be dismissed for lack of prosecution.”).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Recommendation (Filing [50](#)) is adopted;
2. This case is dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41 and NECivR 41.2; and
3. Judgment shall be entered by separate document.

DATED this 7th day of December, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.