

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
SAVANNAH DIVISION

|                                 |   |                    |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| ANGELA NAILS,                   | ) |                    |
|                                 | ) |                    |
| Plaintiff,                      | ) |                    |
|                                 | ) |                    |
| v.                              | ) | CASE NO. CV422-078 |
|                                 | ) |                    |
| LEEDS GATE TOWNHOUSE            | ) |                    |
| ASSOCIATION, LLC; OWNERS OF     | ) |                    |
| LEEDS GATE TOWNHOUSE; and LEEDS | ) |                    |
| GATE TOWNHOUSE RESIDENTS,       | ) |                    |
|                                 | ) |                    |
| Defendants.                     | ) |                    |
| _____                           | ) |                    |

O R D E R

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's October 5, 2022, Report and Recommendation (Doc. 8), to which Plaintiff Angela Nails has filed an objection (Doc. 9). After a careful review of the record,<sup>1</sup> the report and recommendation (Doc. 8) is **ADOPTED** as the Court's opinion in this case.

The Magistrate Judge recommends that this case be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Doc. 8 at 2-7.) In her objection, Plaintiff does not identify any defect in the Magistrate Judge's subject matter jurisdiction analysis. (Doc. 9.) Although


---

<sup>1</sup> The Court reviews de novo a magistrate judge's findings to which a party objects, and the Court reviews for clear error the portions of a report and recommendation to which a party does not object. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see Merchant v. Nationwide Recovery Serv., Inc., 440 F. Supp. 3d 1369, 1371 (N.D. Ga. 2020) (outlining the standard of review for report and recommendations (citing Macort v. Prem, Inc., 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam))).

Plaintiff asserts that her claim arises "under the Constitution," she does not identify any plausible basis for such a claim. (Id. at 1.) Instead, she reaffirms that her Complaint "is about . . . living in her surrounding of other people who are out of control . . . ." (Id.) As the Magistrate Judge correctly observed, "the Court clearly lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over this dispute between neighbors[.]" (Doc. 8 at 2.)

For the foregoing reasons, the Plaintiff's objections (Doc. 9) are **OVERRULED**, the report and recommendation (Doc. 8) is **ADOPTED** as the Court's opinion in this case, and Plaintiff's Complaint and Amended Complaint (Docs. 1, 5) are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to close this case.

SO ORDERED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM T. MOORE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA