UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

JERRY L. MCGLONE, II,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:16-cv-054 CHIEF JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR. Magistrate Judge Chelsey M. Vascura

ROSS CORRECTIONAL INSTITION, et al.,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court for consideration of a Report and Recommendation issued by the Magistrate Judge on August 11, 2017. (ECF No. 18.) The time for filing objections has passed over two months ago, and no objections have been filed to the Report and Recommendation. The Court has twice attempted to mail the Report and Recommendation to Plaintiff and both times the document was returned as undeliverable because Plaintiff no longer resides at the address and has not notified the Court of any change in address.

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.").

Therefore, the Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation. For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, the Court DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) for failure to timely effect service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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