

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

NICHOLAS A. GLADU,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL No. 2:15-cv-384-DBH
)	
CORRECT CARE SOLUTIONS, ET AL.,)	
)	
DEFENDANTS)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING RECOMMENDED DECISIONS AND
RULINGS ON ORDERS OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On November 2, 2016, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the court, with copies to the parties, his Recommended Decision on Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and Motion for Leave to Refile Malpractice Claim (ECF No. 216). On November 21, the plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 228) only with respect to the ruling on the malpractice claim, as well as a motion to withdraw his motion to amend his complaint to add the malpractice claim (ECF No. 226). The plaintiff’s motion to withdraw the motion to amend complaint is **GRANTED**. The plaintiff’s objection to the Recommended Decision is **MOOT**. The Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** on every matter except for the ruling on the malpractice claim, and that portion of the ruling is **VACATED**.

On November 3, 2016, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the court, with copies to the parties, his Recommended Decision on Plaintiff’s

[Renewed] Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF No. 217). The plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 229) on November 21, 2016.

I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in the Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED**. The plaintiff's renewed motion for preliminary injunction is **DENIED**.

The plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 223) to the Magistrate Judge's Order on Plaintiff's Motion for Physical and Mental Examination (ECF No. 218) is **OVERRULED**. The Magistrate Judge's Order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

The plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 230) to the Magistrate Judge's Order on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 219) is **OVERRULED**. The Magistrate Judge's Order stated that if the plaintiff exhausted all of the avenues listed in the Order, he could then file a motion to compel. The record does not demonstrate that he has done so.

SO ORDERED.

DATED THIS 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2016

/s/D. BROCK HORNBY
D. BROCK HORNBY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE