

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

MARK M. LONG,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civil Action 2:15-cv-1616  
Judge Frost  
Magistrate Judge King

DOCTOR EDDY, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff included a jury demand in the civil cover sheet filed in this action, *Civil Cover Sheet* (ECF No. 1-1, PAGEID# 17), and the docket indicates that a jury demand was made. On July 22, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion "requesting to revise the complaint if the file date of 5-6-15 will remain the file date after filing the revised complaint. . . ." *Motion to Amend/Correct Complaint* (ECF No. 8). Noting that plaintiff had not included a copy of the proposed revised complaint and finding that "the purpose of the amendment is not entirely clear from his motion," *Order and Report and Recommendation* (ECF. No. 11), the United States Magistrate Judge denied the motion "without prejudice to renewal upon the tender of the proposed amended complaint." *Id.*, PAGEID# 45 (emphasis omitted). This matter is now before the Court on plaintiff's motion to reconsider that ruling. *Motion for Review of Ruling* (ECF No. 14).

The *Motion for Review of Ruling* makes clear that, in filing the *Motion to Amend/Correct Complaint*, plaintiff intended only to make a jury demand. As noted *supra*, however, plaintiff included a jury demand in the *Civil Cover Sheet*, and the docket indicates that a jury demand has been made.

Because the order of the Magistrate Judge, *Order and Report and Recommendation*, is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law, see 28 U.S.C. §636(b), the *Motion for Review of Ruling* (ECF No. 14), is **DENIED**.

          /s/ GREGORY L. FROST  
Gregory L. Frost  
United States District Judge