

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

DIANE C. MAJETT,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	C.A. No. 18-269WES
	:	
HOUSING AUTHORITIES OF RI, NY,	:	
NH & VT, MYSPACE ENTERTAINMENT:	:	
CULT 2006- PRESENT FRAUD	:	
APPLICANTS SERVICER AND SERVED :	:	
IN MY NAME, ET. AL., and ME TOO	:	
CHASER GROUP,	:	
Defendants.	:	

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

PATRICIA A. SULLIVAN, United States Magistrate Judge.

On May 29, 2018, the complaint and the first amended complaint of Plaintiff Diane C. Majett were recommended to be provisionally dismissed. ECF No. 4 (“R&R”). This recommendation was adopted by text order on June 22, 2018. The dismissal was based on the failure of both pleadings to state a comprehensible claim on which relief might be granted. At the same time, the Court ruled that “Plaintiff has thirty (30) days to amend her Complaint to cure the deficiencies outlined in the R&R (up to and including 7/23/18). Otherwise, her case shall be dismissed with prejudice.” Text Order of June 22, 2018.

Since June 1, 2018, Plaintiff has made a series of filings that appear to be further amendments to the complaint, exhibits and attachments to such amendments and memoranda explicating such amendments – these are docketed as ECF Nos. 5 through 11. Mindful of her *pro se* status, the Court has carefully reviewed all of them in an attempt to ascertain whether any of them (or even any part of one of them) conceivably states a plausible claim for relief sufficiently comprehensible for the Court to allow the case to proceed past screening.

Unfortunately, none of them clears this bar. While Plaintiff is plainly troubled by many events that have taken place over several years, her filings do not set forth a legal cause of action cognizable in this Court. Because her new complaints are still deficient, I now recommend that the case be dismissed.

Any objection to this report and recommendation must be specific and must be served and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days after its service on the objecting party. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); DRI LR Cv 72(d). Failure to file specific objections in a timely manner constitutes waiver of the right to review by the district judge and the right to appeal the Court's decision. See United States v. Lugo Guerrero, 524 F.3d 5, 14 (1st Cir. 2008); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603, 605 (1st Cir. 1980).

/s/ Patricia A. Sullivan
PATRICIA A. SULLIVAN
United States Magistrate Judge
August 20, 2018