King v. Norman et al Doc. 36

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NORTHEASTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM C. KING)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.) No. 2:1	4-0082
) Judge S	Sharp
CANDY NORMAN, et al.)	_
	ORDER	

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation ("R & R") (Docket No. 29) from the Magistrate Judge recommending that Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Docket Nos. 19 & 21) be granted and this case be dismissed with prejudice. Despite being informed that any Objections needed to be filed within fourteen days, and despite the fact that Plaintiff was granted a thirty day extension within which to file objections, none have been filed.

Having undertaken the *de novo* rule required by Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that dismissal is appropriate because a one-year statute of limitations applies to claims brought in Tennessee under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Accordingly, the Court rules as follows:

- (1) The R & R (Docket No. 29) is hereby ACCEPTED and APPROVED;
- (2) The Motions to Dismiss filed by Defendants Josh Hoeppner (Docket No. 19) and Candy Norman (Docket No. 21) are hereby GRANTED; and
 - (3) This case is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

The Clerk of the Court shall enter final judgment in accordance with Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

It is SO ORDERED.

NEVIN H. SHARP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE