Blake v. Rubenstein et al Doc. 8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON DIVISION

ROBERT BLAKE,

Plaintiff,

v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:12-cv-01427

2:12-cv-01446

2:12-cv-01513

JIM RUBENSTEIN, et al.

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On May 4, May 8, and May 14, 2012, Plaintiff Robert Blake, then an inmate at the Mount

Olive Correctional Complex ("MOCC"), filed substantially identical Complaints against the same

four defendants alleging that he is being unfairly denied the opportunity to participate in the

Quality of Life program offered at the MOCC. This Court referred these civil actions to United

States Magistrate Judge Mary E. Stanley for submission of proposed findings of fact and a

recommendation for disposition ("PF&R"). On March 21, 2013, Magistrate Judge Stanley issued

a PF&R recommending that the Court consolidate these three civil actions and dismiss Plaintiff's

Complaints for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or

legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to

which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file

timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this

Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th

Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need

not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not

direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations."

Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections to the March 21, 2013 PF&R in

these cases were due on April 8, 2013. To date, no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R, **CONSOLIDATES** these civil actions [Case

Nos. 2:12-cv-01427, 2:12-cv-01446, and 2:12-cv-01513], **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's Complaints,

and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove these actions from the Court's active docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and

any unrepresented party.

ENTER:

May 28, 2013

HOMAS E. JOHNSTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE