

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| HARRY WILLIAM LOTT, | : | |
| | : | Case No. 2:13-CV-01205 |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| | : | JUDGE ALGENON L. MARBLEY |
| v. | : | |
| | : | Magistrate Judge King |
| OHIO BAR ASSOCIATION, et al., | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants. | : | |

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the United States Magistrate Judge’s **Initial Screening Report and Recommendation** (Doc. 3), recommending that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint (Doc. 1) for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Pro se Plaintiff Harry William Lott brings this case, “another in a long line of frivolous lawsuits initiated . . . in this Court,” against various bar associations and law schools, alleging that these organizations have committed some constitutional wrong in preventing him from practicing law. (Doc. 3 at 1).

In her initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Magistrate Judge found that the Complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, in that it is completely bereft of any allegations which would support claims against these institutions. (Doc. 3 at 2-3). Put simply, the Magistrate Judge found Plaintiff’s claims “unintelligible.” (*Id.* at 3).

Plaintiff was specifically advised of his right to object to this Report and Recommendation, and of the consequences of his failure to do so. (*Id.* at 3-4). He acknowledged service of the Report and Recommendation on December 12, 2013. (Doc. 4). Although he has since filed a pleading styled as an “Amended Complaint” (Doc. 5), it is nearly identical to his original Complaint, and its changes add nothing of substance to any of his allegations. Plaintiff has subsequently filed two Motions for Summary Judgment (Doc. 6; Doc.

7), one Motion for Service (Doc. 9), and two “Affidavits of Service” (Doc. 8; Doc. 9). Nowhere has he objected to the Report and Recommendation, or explained in any way how his allegations state any plausible claim for relief. Nor has Plaintiff actually served, or alleged that he has served, any Defendant.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation. The case is hereby **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Algenon L. Marbley
ALGENON L. MARBLEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: July 21, 2014