UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

GERALD THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:16-cv-812

Dlott, J.
Bowman, M.J.

v.

WARDEN ERDOS, et al.,

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, an incarcerated individual who proceeds *pro se*, tendered a new complaint against multiple defendants on August 4, 2016.[1] After Plaintiff corrected several procedural deficiencies, the undersigned entered an Order that granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* against some of the identified Defendants, while recommending dismissal of many of Plaintiff's claims and defendants.

On August 1, 2017, the undersigned filed a Report and Recommendation that detailed the history of the above-captioned case, including Plaintiff's extensive and repetitive motion practice, which includes multiple motions for preliminary injunctive relief and/or temporary restraining orders. (Doc. 38). Plaintiff has filed objections to the August 1 R&R, which objections remain pending before the presiding district judge. The undersigned incorporates the background and analysis of her August 1, 2017 R&R, and

[1]In the last R&R filed in this case, the Court took judicial notice of the fact that Plaintiff had filed two prior civil rights cases concerning his conditions of confinement: Civil Case 1:14-cv-935, and Case No. 1:15-cv-553, as well as a petition for writ of habeas corpus, which was transferred to the Northern District of Ohio, Case No. 1:16-cv-409. On May 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed yet another case in this Court: *see* Case No. 2:17-cv-461-GCS-EPD.

further incorporates, as if fully restated, an earlier R&R filed on January 18, 2017 (Doc. 19). Plaintiff has been warned in other matters not to re-file previously filed motions that have been ruled upon by the Court. Future repetitive motions will be stricken without further comment.

For the reasons previously set forth in the prior R&Rs, accordingly, **IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT** Plaintiff's latest motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 39) be **DENIED**, without awaiting a response from the Defendants, and alternatively, stricken from the record.

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman
Stephanie K. Bowman
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

GERALD THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:16-cv-812

Dlott, J.
Bowman, M.J.

v.

WARDEN ERDOS, et al.,

Defendants.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation ("R&R") within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent's objections within **FOURTEEN DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn,* 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters,* 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).