

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

DRELIJAH J. MUHAMMAD-ALI,)
a/k/a MARCUS ORLANDO TAITE,)
180644,)

Petitioner,)

v.)

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2:20-cv-608-ECM
(WO)

THE ROYAL COURT OF JUSTICE)
COAT OF ARMS OF ALABAMA, *et al.*,)

Respondents.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION and ORDER

Now pending before the court is the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 3) which recommends that this petition be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Also pending before the Court is the Petitioner’s motion for change of venue (doc. 6). On October 28, 2020, the Petitioner filed Objections to the Recommendation (docs. 4 & 5).

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). 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 first addresses the Petitioner’s motion for change of venue. The Petitioner requests the Court transfer his petition to “Muhammad International Criminal Court of Justice Al-Rabat Morocco Empire Kingdom.” (Doc. 6). The Petitioner offers no legal basis for the Court to take such action. Accordingly, his motion is due to be denied.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and the Petitioner’s objections. In his objections, the Petitioner objects to the dismissal of his petition without any specificity and without stating the bases for his objections. The Petitioner does not point to any legal error committed by the Magistrate Judge but offers only his conclusory assertions that he is not subject to the jurisdiction of this Court or the United States. The Petitioner merely re-offers a recitation of the claims made in his petition and other pleadings. Consequently, the Recommendation is reviewed for clear error, and the Court finds that the Petitioner’s objections are due to be overruled. Accordingly, for the reasons as stated and for good cause, it is

ORDERED as follows:

1. the Petitioner’s objections (docs. 4 & 5) are OVERRULED;
2. the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 3) is ADOPTED;
3. the Petitioner’s motion for change of venue (doc. 6) is DENIED;
4. this case is DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

A final judgment will be entered.

DONE this 18th day of December, 2020.

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