

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
District of Maine**

DEBRA J. REAGAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	No. 2:14-CV-00059-GZS
)	
U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, et als.,)	
)	
Defendant)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE
RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court on September 12, 2014, his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 67). Plaintiff filed her Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 69) on September 25, 2014. Plaintiff filed two Notices of Correction to her Objection (ECF Nos. 70 and 71) on September 27, 2014 and September 30, 2014, respectively. The MERS Defendants filed their Response to Plaintiff's Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 72) on October 14, 2014. The BANA Defendants filed their Response to Plaintiff's Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 73) on October 14, 2014.

I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a de novo determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

1. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

2. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 35 and 42) are **GRANTED**.
3. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motions for Judgment of Default or Summary Judgment (ECF Nos. 61/64) are hereby **DENIED**.
4. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motions (ECF Nos. 38 and 43) are not responsive pleadings, are considered to be nondispositive and are **DENIED**.
5. It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Have Defendant Vargas's Attorney Answer (ECF No. 34) is **MOOT**.

/s/George Z. Singal
U.S. District Judge

Dated this 20th day of October, 2014.