

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

WILLIE R. GRIFFIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO, CITY OF LAS  
VEGAS, CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,  
CITY OF OMAHA, and CITY OF  
JACKSON,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-CV-701-JPS

**ORDER**

On May 18, 2017, the plaintiff, Willie R. Griffin, filed a *pro se* complaint and a petition to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Docket #1 and #2). The case was initially assigned to Magistrate Judge David E. Jones, but because not all parties have had the opportunity to consent to magistrate jurisdiction, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 73(b), the case was reassigned to this Court for screening.

Notwithstanding the payment of any filing fee, the Court must dismiss a complaint filed *in forma pauperis* if it raises claims that are “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Magistrate Jones reviewed and analyzed both the plaintiff’s complaint and his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and determined the plaintiff’s complaint failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted. Thereafter, Magistrate Jones filed a Report and Recommendation with this Court, recommending that: (1) the plaintiff’s

motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee be denied; (2) the case be dismissed. (Docket #6).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2), and E.D. Wis. Gen. L.R. 72(c), any written objections to that recommendation, or any part thereof, were to be filed within fourteen days of the date of service of the recommendation.

To date, no party has filed such an objection.<sup>1</sup>

The Court has considered Magistrate Jones' recommendation and, having received no objection thereto, will adopt it.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge David E. Jones' report and recommendation (Docket #6) be and the same is hereby **ADOPTED**;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee (Docket #2) be and the same is hereby **DENIED**; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this action be and the same is hereby **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

---

<sup>1</sup>The docket shows that the copy of the recommendation sent to the plaintiff was returned to the Court undeliverable and no forwarding address has been provided. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to provide and maintain with the Court a current address. E.D. Wis. Gen. L.R. 4. The plaintiff's failure to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation will not be excused on the grounds that he did not provide the Court with a current address and therefore did not receive a copy of the recommendation.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 28th day of July, 2017.

BY THE COURT:



J.P. Stadtmueller  
U.S. District Judge