


Plaintiff argues that he has satisfied the first factor for an injunction because the Defendants exhibited deliberate indifference by failing to adequately treat an abscess in his jaw. (Doc. No. 58.) The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge, that Plaintiff has not demonstrated deliberate indifference. Plaintiff has received consistent treatment from prison and outside physicians, including the prescription of antibiotics and ibuprofen. (Doc. No. 60 at 15-16.) The Court also concurs with the Magistrate Judge that the medical records and March 2017 hearing reflect that Plaintiff does not risk suffering irreparable harm. (Doc. No. 44.)

The Magistrate Judge properly considered the factual record and applied the preliminary injunction standard. See Leary, 228 F.3d at 736. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Doc. No. 64) that the Court construes as a motion to ascertain status is **DENIED AS MOOT** and Plaintiff's Motions for a Preliminary Injunction (Doc. Nos. 3 and 14) are **DENIED**, for the reasons in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation that is adopted by this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



WAVERLY D. CRENSHAW, JR.
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE