

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

BERNADETTE DICKERSON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIV. ACT. NO. 2:20-cv-163-ECM
	)	(WO)
KOCH FOODS, LLC, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION and ORDER**

Now pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 65) which recommends that the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (doc. 43) be granted and that this case be dismissed with prejudice. On July 18, 2022, the Plaintiff filed objections to the Recommendation. (Doc. 66). The next day, the Plaintiff filed additional objections (doc. 67). The Court has carefully reviewed the record in this case, including the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, and the Plaintiff’s objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

When a party objects to a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the district court must review the disputed portions *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court “may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or resubmit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” FED.R.CIV.P. 72(b)(3). *De novo* review requires that the district court independently consider factual issues based on the record. *Jeffrey S. ex rel. Ernest S. v. State Bd. of Educ.*, 896 F.2d 507, 513 (11th Cir. 1990). *See also United States v. Gopie*, 347 F. App’x 495, 499 n.1 (11th Cir. 2009). However, objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation must

be sufficiently specific in order to warrant *de novo* review. *See Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x 781, 783-85 (11th Cir. 2006). Otherwise, a Report and Recommendation is reviewed for clear error. *Id.*

The Court has carefully reviewed the entire record in this case, the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and the Plaintiff's objections. The Plaintiff's objections largely reiterate her claims against the Defendants, their attorneys and the Magistrate Judge. Although the Plaintiff's general objections do not merit *de novo* review, the Court undertook a *de novo* review of Plaintiff's objections. The Plaintiff again offers only her conclusory assertions that she was harassed, discriminated against and retaliated against by the Defendants. She makes conclusory assertions that she is entitled to relief against the Defendants and offers a recitation of her claims, but she does not point to any legal error committed by the Magistrate Judge. The Court finds that the well-reasoned Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge effectively addresses all of the Plaintiff's claims. The Plaintiff's objections are due to be overruled. Accordingly, for the reasons as stated and for good cause, it is

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's objections (docs. 66 and 67) are OVERRULED, the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 65) is ADOPTED, the the Defendants' motion for summary judgment (doc. 43) is GRANTED, and this case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

A final judgment will be entered.

DONE this 21st day of July, 2022.

/s/ Emily C. Marks  
EMILY C. MARKS  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE