

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

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| PETER JAMES SMITH, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CIVIL ACT. NO. 2:21-cv-335-ECM |
| |) | (WO) |
| RETIREMENT SYSTEMS OF |) | |
| ALABAMA, <i>et al.</i> , |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

OPINION and ORDER

Now pending before the court is the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 17) which recommends that this case be dismissed without prejudice for the Plaintiff’s failure to abide by the orders of this Court. On April 1, 2022, the Plaintiff filed objections to the Recommendation. (Doc. 21).

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 Stokes v. Singletary*, 952 F.2d 1567, 1576 (11th Cir. 1992) (“[w]henver any party files a

