**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO**
**EASTERN DIVISION**

**ANNA M. VINES CARTER,**
**Plaintiff,**

**Case No. 2:14-cv-2343**
**CHIEF JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.**
**Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Preston Deavers**

**v.**

**GRANT HOSPITAL et al.,**
**Defendants.**

---

**ANNA M. VINES CARTER,**
**Plaintiff,**

**Case No. 2:14-cv-2345**
**CHIEF JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.**
**Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Preston Deavers**

**v.**

**OSU HARDING HOSPITAL et al.,**
**Defendants.**

**ORDER**

On December 3, 2014, the United States Magistrate Judge recommended that these cases be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to state a claim. (Case No. 2:14-cv-2343, ECF No. 3 & Case No. 2:14-cv-2345, ECF No. 2.) The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge specifically advises parties that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of the Report results in a "waiver of the right to *de novo* review . . . by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court." The time period for filing objections to the Report and Recommendation has expired. No party has objected to the Report and Recommendation.

The record reflects that the Report and Recommendation was mailed to Plaintiff but that it was returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff has an affirmative duty to notify the Court of any change in address. *See Barber v. Runyon*, No. 93-6318, 1994 WL 163765, at *1 (6th Cir. May 2, 1994) ("If [*pro se* Plaintiff's] address changed, she had an affirmative duty to supply the court with notice of any and all changes in her address."); *see also Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991) ("[W]hile *pro se* litigants may be entitled to some latitude when dealing with sophisticated legal issues . . . there is no cause for extending this margin to straightforward procedural requirements that a layperson can comprehend."); *Walker v. Cognis Oleo Chem., LLC*, No. 1:07cv289, 2010 WL 717275, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 26, 2010) ("By failing to keep the Court apprised of his current address, Plaintiff demonstrates a lack of prosecution of his action.").

The Court reviewed the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers. No objections have been filed and that the time for filing such objections has expired. Although Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint in her two cases, Plaintiff did not cure the deficiencies identified in the Report and Recommendation. The Court therefore **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Case No. 2:14-cv-2343, ECF No. 3 & Case No. 2:14-cv-2345, ECF No. 2) and **DISMISSES** these two cases.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6-4-2015
**DATE**

**EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.**
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**