

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
 at CHATTANOOGA

RALPH E. UMPHREY,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	Case No. 1:15-cv-276
v.)	
)	Judge Mattice
PINERIDGE TREATMENT CENTER,)	Magistrate Judge Lee
)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	
)	

ORDER

On October 22, 2015, United States Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee filed her Report and Recommendation (Doc. 3) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, Plaintiff’s action – which seeks damages in connection with Plaintiff being allegedly “roboticised” against his will – be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted. (*Id.*).

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation, as well as the record, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Lee’s well-reasoned conclusions.

¹ Magistrate Judge Lee 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 any right to appeal. (Doc. 3 at 2 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 objections has now expired.

