

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
STATESBORO DIVISION**

WASEEM DAKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRIAN OWENS, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:14-cv-47

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's April 16, 2021 Order. (Doc. 306.) For the reasons below, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Order. The Magistrate Judge's Order remains the Order of the Court.

When a magistrate judge rules on a non-dispositive pretrial discovery matter, parties may object to that ruling and seek review from the district judge under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). In reviewing the magistrate judge's order, the district judge must "modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." *Id.* The clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard "is exceedingly deferential." *Jackson v. Deen*, CV 412-139, 2013 WL 3991793, at \*2 (S.D. Ga. Aug. 2, 2013) (citing *Pigott v. Sanibel Dev., LLC*, CV 07-0083, 2008 WL 2937804, at \*5 (S.D. Ala. July 23, 2008)). "A ruling is clearly erroneous where either the magistrate judge abused his discretion or the district court, after reviewing the entirety of the record, is left with a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made." *Id.* (citations omitted). "A decision by the magistrate judge is contrary to law where it either fails to follow or misapplies the applicable law." *Id.* (citations omitted).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's April 16, 2021 Order and Plaintiff's Objections to that Order. Plaintiff fails to demonstrate any of the Magistrate Judge's decisions in that Order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Plaintiff's Objections consist almost entirely of meritless arguments that have been considered—and properly rejected—numerous times in this matter.<sup>1</sup> (See Docs. 234, 258.) Therefore, the Court **OVERRULES** all of Plaintiff's Objections.

**SO ORDERED**, this 27th day of May, 2022.



---

R. STAN BAKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

---

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Plaintiff's subsequent motions to amend, all of which Plaintiff claims are an improvement to the proposed Amended Complaint the Magistrate Judge rejected on April 16, 2021, have also been denied. (Docs. 354, 410, 420.)