

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

JARRITT R. FORD,)	
)	CASE NO. 5:11cv575
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
)	
DREW ALEXANDER, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</u>
Defendants.)	<u>ORDER</u> [Regarding ECF No. 69]

On February 22, 2013, Magistrate Judge Kathleen B. Burke issued a Report (“R&R”) recommending that *pro se* Plaintiff Ford’s Motion for Summary Judgment ([ECF No. 28](#)) be denied, and that Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment ([ECF No. 42](#)) be granted, thereby dismissing Plaintiff’s Federal claims with prejudice. [ECF No. 69](#). The R&R also recommended that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s claims against the unnamed John and Jane Doe Defendants without prejudice and decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s remaining State law claims, and dismiss those claims without prejudice. [ECF No. 69 at 29](#).

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a report and recommendation to which the parties have made an objection. [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(C\)](#). Parties must file any objections to a report and recommendation within 14 days of service. *Id.*; [Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#). Failure to object within this time waives a party’s right to appeal the district court’s judgment. [Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 145 \(1985\)](#); [United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 \(6th Cir. 1981\)](#). Absent objection, a district court may adopt a magistrate judge’s report without review. See [Thomas, 474 U.S. at 149](#).

(5:11cv575)

In the instant case, objections to the R&R were due by March 8, 2013. Plaintiff has not filed an objection. The Court finds that the R&R is supported by the record, and agrees with the magistrate judge's recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court adopts the R&R ([ECF No. 69](#)) in its entirety. Plaintiff's Federal claims are dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff's claims against the unnamed John and Jane Doe Defendants are dismissed without prejudice. The Court declines to accept supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's remaining State law claims, and dismisses these claims without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 12, 2013
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson
Benita Y. Pearson
United States District Judge