

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SALAAM JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIEUTENANT PRIMMER, *et al.*

Defendants.

ORDER

10-cv-316-slc

Plaintiff Salaam P. Johnson is proceeding in this case on First Amendment claims that he was improperly denied electronics for 65 days and retaliated against for using the inmate complaint review system. On April 15, 2011, the court denied plaintiff's second motion to compel discovery. On April 29, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of that decision, in part asserting that his motion should be construed as an objection to a magistrate's order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In denying the motion, I rejected that argument because plaintiff has already consented to my jurisdiction over the case.

Now plaintiff has filed a document titled "objection," in which he again invokes 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), arguing that this provision applies because not all of the parties have consented to my jurisdiction. Plaintiff appears to contend that the *defendants* have not consented to my jurisdiction, but they filed their consent last November in the form of a boilerplate consent letter from 2008. *See* Dkt. 34. I will attach a copy of this letter to this order. Because all of the parties have consented, I properly have jurisdiction over this case, and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Accordingly, plaintiff's objection is denied.

Next, plaintiff has filed a document titled "motion for an order to compel inspection," in which he expresses concern that his summary judgment materials did not arrive at this court. He asks for an "in person page-by-page inspection" of these materials. I will deny this motion because plaintiff provides no reason why he thinks his summary judgment materials have not

been delivered to the court, or that someone has tampered with them. The court has received those documents and they appear to be intact.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that:

- (1) Plaintiff's objection, dkt. 74, is DENIED; and
- (2) Plaintiff's "motion for an order to compel inspection," dkt. 87, is DENIED.

Entered this 18th day of July, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge