

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>WILLIAM C. BULLOCK,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:09-CV-1902</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
<b>BIMBO BAKERIES USA and</b>	:	
<b>ANGIE LASHOMB,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 1st day of July, 2010, upon consideration of the motion (Doc. 32) for sanctions filed by plaintiff William C. Bullock (“Bullock”), wherein Bullock contends that he never received from defendants a copy of their response to his objections to the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and that he had no opportunity to respond to the filing in question,<sup>1</sup> and the court finding that Bullock has failed to establish that sanctions are warranted,<sup>2</sup> and the court noting that Bullock has also failed

---

<sup>1</sup> Bullock alleges that he received a copy of defendants’ filing from the Clerk of Court on April 28, 2010, the same day he received the court order granting judgment in favor of defendants.

<sup>2</sup> Bullock argues that defendants must have neglected their obligation to mail a copy of their filing to him, but his allegations do not provide the court with a sufficient basis to reach this conclusion. Defendants aver that they did mail a copy of the document in question to Bullock. (See Doc. 34 at 3-4). Even if the court assumes that Bullock never received the copy that defendants purport to have mailed to him, there may be other explanations for the loss or misdelivery of the document. The court cannot conclude that defendants failed to comply with their obligations under the rules.

to show that he was prejudiced as a result of his delayed receipt of the document,<sup>3</sup> it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 32) for sanctions is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout the litigation, Bullock has repeatedly raised arguments that are essentially the same. (See, e.g., Docs. 14, 27, 31). Hence, although Bullock complains that he had “no chance to respond[,]” (Doc. 35 at 2), the court is not persuaded that Bullock was prejudiced by the alleged circumstances.