

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Judge Edward W. Nottingham

Civil Action No. 05-cv-01858-EWN-MJW

SEAN HARRINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MADLINE WILSON and the
“LAW OFFICE OF MADLINE WILSON”;
CHRISTY RYAN;
BILL J. FYFE and
COLUMBINE COUNSELING CENTER, P.C.;
LAURA ARCILISE, in her personal capacity;
LOUISE CULBERSON-SMITH, in her
personal capacity;
JOHN GLEASON, in his personal capacity and
his official capacity (as Attorney Regulation
Counsel);
WENDELL PRYOR, in his official capacity as
Director of the Colorado Civil Rights Division &
Colorado Civil Rights Commission;
ROBERT EVANS, in his official capacity as
ADA Coordinator and Court Administrator for
the First Judicial District; the
JEFFERSON COUNTY COMBINED COURT,
through the COLORADO ATTORNEY
GENERAL, JOHN SUTHERS (in his official
capacity),

Defendants.

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S RECOMMENDATION AND
STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTIONS THERETO**

On September 22, 2006, this court prematurely entered an Order (#74) accepting the assigned magistrate judge's recommendation that all claims against all Defendants be dismissed. The Order was premature, because Plaintiff's time for objecting to the recommendation had not yet expired. Noting this, Plaintiff has moved for reconsideration (#75) and filed objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. (##76, 77). The motion for reconsideration will be granted, but the objections will be stricken. The case will stand as dismissed with prejudice.

It is hard to imagine a more frivolous, burdensome, prolix, senseless, and harassing filing than the one containing Plaintiff's objections. The objections themselves are spread over 2,610 pages, and the exhibits occupy an additional sixty pages. The bulk of the filing consists of an apparently random mixture of copies of cases and exhibits. It is impossible to follow or make sense of this heap, and any attempt to do so would require abandonment of all other cases. The assigned magistrate judge has performed yeoman service in reviewing the case and making a thorough recommendation. The objections to the recommendation are "redundant, immaterial, [and] impertinent," Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) and will be stricken. The court has once again conducted the requisite *de novo* review of the issues and the recommendation. Based on this review, the court still has concluded that the recommendation is a correct application of the facts and the law. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED as follows:

1. The motion for reconsideration (#75) is **GRANTED**.
2. The objections (##76, 77) are **STRICKEN**.
3. The recommendation is **ACCEPTED**.

4. Defendant Christy Ryan's Motion to Dismiss (#25) is GRANTED.
5. The Fyfe Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#29) is GRANTED.
6. Defendant Madeline Wilson and the Law Office of Madeline Wilson's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (#38) is GRANTED.
7. The State Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (##39 and 42) are GRANTED.
8. The case is dismissed in its entirety, with prejudice.
9. The Plaintiff's Emergency Forthwith Motion for Preliminary Injunction and for Sanctions (#52) is DENIED.

DATED this 25th day of September, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Edward W. Nottingham
EDWARD W. NOTTINGHAM
United States District Judge