



Recommendation. Although these Objections are untimely to say the least,<sup>1</sup> the Court has carefully considered them.

Plaintiff objects to the dismissal of Officers Costa and Battle from this lawsuit because they violated “standard operating procedure” and his Constitutional rights. He fails, however, to identify any actions that the Officers took. He also makes no mention of which Constitutional rights the officers allegedly violated. In his original complaint he alleged that the Officers failed to provide him with two meals but, as the Magistrate Judge concluded, these actions do not rise to the level of a Constitutional injury. His objections are in essence conclusory statements without factual support and present no new evidence or arguments that the Court did not already consider in issuing its Order.

After careful review of the Recommendation and Plaintiff’s objections to it, the Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED for the reasons stated above, and this Court’s original ruling dismissing Defendants Costa and Battle remains effective.

So Ordered, this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007.

*s/ Hugh Lawson*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**HUGH LAWSON**  
US District Judge

tch

---

<sup>1</sup>Plaintiff had ten days after he received the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation to file written objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Clerk of the Court mailed the Recommendation on July 21, 2006. This Court issued the Order adopting those Recommendations and dismissing Defendants Costa and Battle on January 10, 2007. Plaintiff Filed his Motion to Reconsider on January 25, 2007, more than four months after the Recommendation was mailed.