

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

MELVIN KERCHIEE, JR., and)	
DEBORAH SEQUICHIE-KERCHEE,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	No. CIV-11-459-C
)	
JUDGE MARK SMITH, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On January 11 and January 13, 2012, Magistrate Judge Robert E. Bacharach issued four Reports and Recommendations (“R&R”) recommending:

That the Motion to Dismiss filed by Scott Adams and the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Emmit Tayloe be granted (Dkt. 188);

That the Motion for Sanctions filed by Scott Adams be denied (Dkt. No. 189);

That Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions be denied (Dkt. No. 193);

That the motion to dismiss filed by Michael Gassaway should be granted (Dkt. No. 195).

Plaintiff has timely responded, in objection, to at least two of these R&Rs* and the court therefore treats all matters de novo. As in his previous objections, Plaintiff merely

* Plaintiff’s Dkt. No. 197 is entitled “Plaintiff’s Objections to Defendant Scott Adams Counsel, Mr. Carl Hughes “Response” to Plaintiff’s Part IV Rebuttal (“Plaintiff’s Motions for Sanctions Against Defendant Adams”). Filed 01/11/12 Doc #187.” The Court will treat this pleading as an objection to the Report and Recommendation as it was filed one week after the R&R and no other objection has been filed. No objection has been filed as to Defendant’s Motion for Sanctions although the time to do so has expired.

restates and reargues those matters which were fully considered by Judge Bacharach. Judge Bacharach's R&Rs treat each and every issue raised by Plaintiff and dispose of them accurately. Indeed, Judge Bacharach's patience in dealing with Plaintiff's sometimes illegible, always repetitive, arguments is admirable. There is nothing the undersigned can add to the explanations, and certainly Plaintiff has asserted nothing in his endless objections that would suggest or permit a different result.

Accordingly, the Court adopts each of the R&Rs and therefore Defendant Scott Adams' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint (Dkt. No. 118) is granted with prejudice and Defendant Tayloe's Opening Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 81) is granted; Defendant Scott Adams' Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions is denied; Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Against Defendant Adams Counsel, Mr. Carl Hughes, Esq. (Dkt. No. 182) is denied; the Motion to Dismiss filed by Michael Gassaway (Dkt. No. 139) is granted without prejudice as to the breach of contract claim, in all other respects the dismissal is with prejudice. A judgment will enter accordingly. All pending motions are denied as moot. With these dispositions, no claim or defendants remain, and the case is closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 1st day of February, 2012.


ROBIN J. CAUTHRON
United States District Judge