

(explaining the appropriate objection procedure).] Generally, this Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c). When no objections are made, as in this case, the Court is not required to “review . . . a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 151 (1985). Further, parties who fail to object to a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation are also barred from appealing a district court’s order adopting that Report and Recommendation. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

Despite Mr. Hodge’s lack of objections, the Court has fully reviewed the record and Judge Wehrman’s Report and Recommendation. In light of Mr. Hodge’s repeated failure to comply with the Court’s orders and the multiple warnings issued to Mr. Hodge to encourage his compliance, it agrees with Judge Wehrman’s recommendation to dismiss the action.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ORDERS** as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation issued by Judge Wehrman [R. 34] is **ADOPTED** as and for the Opinion of the Court;
2. The remaining claims in Plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights complaint are **DISMISSED**;
3. Any pending motions are **DENIED, AS MOOT**; and
4. This action is **STRICKEN** from the Court’s active docket.

This the 5th day of January, 2017.



Gregory F. Van Tatenhove
United States District Judge