Robertson v. Jay et al Doc. 32

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

VANESSA LYNN ROBERTSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-15-172-D
)	
SHERIFF SCOTT JAY; and)	
CAPTAIN DIANA BILBO,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, brought the present action, alleging Defendants violated her constitutional rights in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Suzanne Mitchell for initial proceedings in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Defendants filed the court-ordered Special Report and a Motion to Dismiss and/or Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. No. 29]. Plaintiff did not respond. On November 17, 2015, the Magistrate Judge filed her Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 31] in which she recommended the Court grant Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *Id.* at 9.

In her Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the right to file objections to the same and directed the parties to file any objections no later than December 7, 2015. *Id.* The Magistrate Judge further admonished the

parties that failure to timely object would constitute a waiver of the right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation. *Id.* at 9-10. The deadline for filing objections has expired and to date, neither party has filed objections or sought an extension of time in which to do so. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 31] is **ADOPTED** as though fully set forth herein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**, as more fully set forth in the Report and Recommendation. A judgment shall be entered accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED this <u>28th</u> day of December, 2015.

TIMOTHY D. DEGIUSTI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE