IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-609-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-614-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-626-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-628-MHT-GMB (WO)

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-674-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-711-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-712-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-713-MHT-GMB (WO)

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-714-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-812-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-012-MHT-GMB (WO)
BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-027-MHT-GMB (WO)

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*, Defendants.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-395-MHT-GMB (WO)

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, Defendant.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-469-MHT-GMB (WO)

BILL LIETZKE, Plaintiff, v. GREYHOUND LINES, INC., Defendant.	)))))))))	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-488-MHT-GMB (WO)

OPINION

Plaintiff Bill Lietzke filed these 15 cases asserting that he was illegally detained and abused on various occasions. These cases are before the court on the recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge that they be consolidated, that plaintiff's motions to proceed in forma pauperis be granted, that Lietzke's federal claims be dismissed under 28

U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and that the court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his state-law claims. Also before the court are plaintiff's objections to the recommendation. After an independent and de novo review of the record, the court concludes that objections should be overruled and the magistrate judge's recommendation adopted, except for the recommendation of consolidation. The cases will remain separate.

An appropriate judgment will be entered in each case.

DONE, this the 23rd day of August, 2018.

/s/ Myron H. Thompson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE