

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at CHATTANOOGA

BOBBY DODD,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	Case No. 1:14-cv-358
v.	)	
	)	Judge Mattice
CITY OF CHATTANOOGA,	)	
TENNESSEE, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	Magistrate Judge Steger
	)	
<i>Defendants.</i>	)	

**ORDER**

On January 4, 2016, United States Magistrate Judge Christopher H. Steger filed his Report and Recommendation (Doc. 46). Magistrate Judge Steger recommended that Plaintiff’s Second Motion to Amend/ Revise Complaint (Doc. 35) be denied.

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Court has conducted a review of the Report and Recommendation, as well as the record, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Steger’s well-reasoned conclusions. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ACCEPTS and ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 46), and Plaintiff’s Second Motion to Amend/ Revise Complaint (Doc. 35) is hereby **DENIED**.

---

<sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Steger specifically advised Plaintiff that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 46 at 3 n.1); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”). Even taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which Plaintiff could timely file any objections has now expired.

**SO ORDERED** this 25th day of January, 2016.

          /s/ *Harry S. Mattice, Jr.*            
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE