

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE

ARTHUR D. GOLDSTEIN, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff )  
 )  
 v. ) Civil No. 98-0103-B  
 )  
 MARGOT JOLY, et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants )

***RECOMMENDED DECISION***

Plaintiff has filed a “Motion for Summary Judgement [sic] etc.” The Motion fails to comply with either this Court’s local rules or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff begins by describing his physical infirmities, which have been the subject of many procedural motions and orders throughout this litigation, and then proceeds to assert that his motion for summary judgment is “simplicity itself,” needing no citation. Plaintiff is incorrect in that assertion. Plaintiff then explains that he is not able to participate in this litigation and does not know when he will be able to do so. However, Defendants have all filed Motions for Summary Judgment that do comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and local rule 56, and they are entitled to rulings on those Motions. I recommend Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment be DENIED in its entirety.

**NOTICE**

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1988) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

---

Eugene W. Beaulieu  
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated on: August 19, 1999