

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

**GORDON BROOKS,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**MARY POTTER, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**Case No. 2:13-cv-0507  
Judge Gregory L. Frost  
Magistrate Judge King**

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Gordon Brooks is an incarcerated state inmate who brought this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against four employees of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

This matter is before the Court for consideration of:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation filed on October 31, 2013, in which the Magistrate Judge recommended that the motions to dismiss of Defendants Mary Potter (ECF No. 22) and Michele Miller (ECF No. 23) be granted; and
2. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation filed on November 22, 2013, in which the Magistrate Judge recommended that the claims against the remaining Defendants be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to effect service of process and that this action be dismissed.

(ECF Nos. 28 and 30.)

In each Report and Recommendation referenced above, the Magistrate Judge specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of the date of the Report results in a waiver of the right to de novo review by the District Judge and a waiver of the right to appeal the District Court's decision adopting the Report and

Recommendation. (ECF No. 28 at PageID# 182-83; ECF No. 30 at PageID# 185-86.) The time period for filing objections to each Report and Recommendation has expired. Plaintiff has not objected to either Report and Recommendation.

The Court has reviewed each Report and Recommendation filed by the Magistrate Judge. Noting that no objections have been filed and the time for filing such objections has expired, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 28) that the motions to dismiss of Defendants Potter and Miller be granted and also **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 30) that the remaining Defendants be dismissed and this action be dismissed. Accordingly, this Court **GRANTS** the motions to dismiss of Defendants Potter and Miller (ECF Nos. 22 and 23), **DISMISSES** all claims against the remaining Defendants, and **HEREBY DISMISSES** this action.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Gregory L. Frost  
**GREGORY L. FROST**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**