

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TODD MATTHEW SONDEY,

Petitioner,

CASE NUMBER: 05-71831

HONORABLE VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

v.

JEFF WHITE,

Respondent.

_____ /

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On November 18, 2009, Magistrate Judge Paul J. Komives submitted a Report and Recommendation (Doc. #39) recommending the Court DENY Petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus. (Doc. #1). The recommendation says:

The parties to this action may object to and seek review of this Report and Recommendation, but are required to act within ten (10) days of service of a copy hereof as provided for in 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and E.D. Mich. LR 72.1(d)(2). Failure to file *specific objections* constitutes a waiver of any further right of appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Howard v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). Filing of objections which raise some issues but fail to raise others *with specificity*, will not preserve all the objections a party might have to this Report and Recommendation. See *Willis v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs.*, 931 F.2d 390, 401 (6th Cir. 1991). *Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

(Emphasis added).

Petitioner filed objections on November 30, 2009:

“due to the petitioner having no specialized training and knowledge in the science of law, through the aid of a ‘Jail house Lawyer’ and because petitioner has presented too many issues in his petition to be specifically addressed on an individual basis, Petitioner hereby objects to any/all

recommendations made by the magistrate not in his favor. Thus preserving any/all issue(s) for further review.”

“[A] general objection to a magistrate’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not satisfy the requirement that an objection be filed.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (citing *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Services*, 932 F.2d 505, 508-09 (6th Cir. 1991)); see also *Cowherd v. Million*, 380 F.3d 909, 912 (6th Cir. 2004) (“the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate’s report constitutes a waiver of those objections”) (citing *Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380).

Because Petitioner’s objections are too general for *de novo* review, See *Stoddard v. United States*, 2009 WL 3199065 at *2 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 30, 2009) (“This Court reviews *de novo* those portions of a[] [Report and Recommendation] to which specific objections are made”), the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation; Petitioner’s application for the writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED**. See *Slater v. Potter*, 2002 WL 172726 at **1 (6th Cir. Feb. 1, 2002) (“The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object”) (citing *Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380).

IT IS ORDERED.

s/Victoria A. Roberts
Victoria A. Roberts
United States District Judge

Dated: December 9, 2009

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and Todd Sondey by electronic means or U.S. Mail on December 9, 2009.

s/Linda Vertriest _____
Deputy Clerk