

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**STEVEN S. BROWN,**

**Plaintiff,**

vs.

**Case No.: 2:13-cv-006  
JUDGE GEORGE C. SMITH  
Magistrate Judge Vascura**

**DIRECTOR MOHR, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**ORDER**

On April 23, 2018, the United States Magistrate Judge issued a *Report and Recommendation* recommending that Plaintiff's pro se Emergency Motion Addendum to Motion for Protection and for a Preliminary Injunction be denied. (Doc. 224, *Report and Recommendation*).

The parties were advised of their right to object to the *Report and Recommendation*. This matter is now before the Court on Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Order and Report and Recommendation*, as well as an additional Addendum. (See Doc. 226). Defendants have filed a response to Plaintiff's Objections. (Doc. 227). The Court will consider the matter *de novo*. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

Plaintiff's Objections merely present the same issues presented to and considered by the Magistrate Judge in the *Report and Recommendation*. Specifically, Plaintiff continues to assert that he has serious medical conditions that are not being addressed and he is being denied access to the Courts. However, he has not actually raised an objection to the Magistrate Judge's conclusions. "An 'objection' that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate's suggested resolution or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an 'objection' as that term is used in this context." *Aldrich v. Bock*, 327 F.Supp.2d 743, 747 (E.D. Mich. 2004). A general

objection to the magistrate's report has the same effect as a failure to object. *Id. See also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 151 (1985) ("where a magistrate makes a finding or ruling on a motion or an issue, his determination should become that of the district court, unless specific objection is filed within a reasonable time").

The Magistrate Judge carefully considered all of Plaintiff's arguments in ruling on the pending motions and the Court agrees with the findings of the Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff's current arguments relate to his treatment at the Warren Correctional Institution, however, Plaintiff's claims in this case relate to his treatment while incarcerated at the Ross Correctional Institution. A district court does not have the authority to issue injunctive relief on the basis of claimed injuries or actions that are unrelated to the allegations in the movant's complaint. *See Colvin v. Caruso*, 605 F.3d 282, 299-300 (6th Cir. 2010).

Based on the aforementioned and the reasons stated in the *Report and Recommendation*, this Court finds that Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Therefore, the *Report and Recommendation*, Document 224, is **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**. Plaintiff's Emergency Motion is hereby **DENIED**. For the same reasons as set forth in the Report and Recommendation and the Order above, Plaintiff's Additional Motion in Support of Request for an Injunction and Restraining Order (Doc. 225) is also **DENIED**.

The Clerk shall remove Documents 223, 224, 225, and 226 from the Court's pending motions list.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*/s/ George C. Smith*  
**GEORGE C. SMITH, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**