

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

GREG ADKISSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:13-CV-505-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

Lead Case Consolidated with

KEVIN THOMPSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:13-CV-666-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

as consolidated with

JOE CUNNINGHAM, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:14-CV-20-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

BILL ROSE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-17-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

CRAIG WILKINSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-274-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

ANGIE SHELTON, as wife and next of)	
Kin on behalf of Mike Shelton, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-420-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

JOHNNY CHURCH,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-460-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
DONALD R. VANGUILDER, JR.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-462-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
JUDY IVENS, as sister and next of kin,)	
on behalf of JEAN NANCE, deceased,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-635-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
PAUL RANDY FARROW,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-636-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

This civil matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation entered by United States Magistrate Judge H. Bruce Guyton, on October 1, 2018 (the “R&R”) [Doc. 326]. In the R&R, Magistrate Judge Guyton recommends that plaintiffs’ Motion for Sanctions [Doc. 288 in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505; Doc. 282 in *Thompson*, 3:13-CV-666; Doc. 263 in *Cunningham*, 3:14-CV-20; Doc. 205 in *Rose*, 3:15-CV-17; Doc. 213 in *Wilkinson*, 3:15-CV-274; Doc. 194 in *Shelton*, 3:15-CV-420; Doc. 195 in *Church*, 3:15-

CV-460; Doc. 198 in *Vanguilder*, 3:15-CV-462; not docketed in *Ivens*, 3:16-CV-635, or *Farrow*, 3:16-CV-636], be denied. There have been no timely objections to the R&R, and enough time has passed since the filing of the R&R to treat any objections as having been waived. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

After a careful review of the matter, the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Guyton's recommendations, which the Court adopts and incorporates into its ruling. As such, the Court **ACCEPTS IN WHOLE** the R&R [Doc. 326]. Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions [Doc. 288 in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505; Doc. 282 in *Thompson*, 3:13-CV-666; Doc. 263 in *Cunningham*, 3:14-CV-20; Doc. 205 in *Rose*, 3:15-CV-17; Doc. 213 in *Wilkinson*, 3:15-CV-274; Doc. 194 in *Shelton*, 3:15-CV-420; Doc. 195 in *Church*, 3:15-CV-460; Doc. 198 in *Vanguilder*, 3:15-CV-462; not docketed in *Ivens*, 3:16-CV-635, or *Farrow*, 3:16-CV-636] is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Thomas A. Varlan
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE