




(4th Cir. 1983). Here, the plaintiff has filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that rambles on generally as to why his claim is not frivolous. However, plaintiff does not object to Magistrate Judge Webb's finding that plaintiff has violated the "three-strikes" statute 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff also does not object to the finding that the instant action appears to be identical to previous claims raised by the plaintiff in *Bailey v. Ingram, et al.*, No. 5:09-00370-F (Oct. 9, 2009). Further plaintiff does not object to the finding that no allegation of danger or threat of serious injury as to overcome the gate-keeping provisions of § 1915(g) has been asserted. Finding no objection to the specific findings of the M&R, this Court considers whether the M&R is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). The Court finds no clear error in the Magistrate Judge's decision, and therefore adopts the M&R.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, DENIES plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis under the "three-strikes" rule, and DISMISSES plaintiff's claim as frivolous. The clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close the file.

SO ORDERED,

this 23 day of January, 2014.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRENCE W. BOYLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE