

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MARCUS HANSERD,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 15-cv-13201

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

N. SOUDER,

Defendant.

**ORDER (1) OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS (ECF #27) TO
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, (2)
ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDED
DISPOSITION, AND (3) GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF #24)**

In this action, Plaintiff Marcus Hanserd (“Hanserd”) alleges that Defendant Natalie Souder (“Souder”) violated his First Amendment rights. After Souder moved for summary judgment, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which she recommends that the Court grant summary judgment in favor of Souder (the “R&R”). (*See* ECF #24.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed parties that if they wanted to seek review of her recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.* at 10-11, Pg. ID 147-48.)

On March 2, 2017, Hanserd filed timely objections to the R&R (the “Objections”). (*See* ECF #27). The Objections, however, only quote portions of the

R&R and do not make any arguments about why the Magistrate Judge erred. (*See id.* at 1-2, Pg. ID 152-153.) “An ‘objection’ that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate's suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an ‘objection’ as that term is used in this context.” *Aldrich v. Bock*, 327 F. Supp. 2d 743, 747 (E.D. Mich. 2004). *See also Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (“[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. The objections must be clear enough to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious”).¹ Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** the Objections (ECF #27) are **OVERRULED**.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s recommended disposition in the R&R is **ADOPTED** and Souder’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #24) is **GRANTED**.

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 27, 2017

¹ *See also Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 Fed. App’x 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009) (“A general objection to the entirety of the magistrate's report has the same effects as would failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the magistrate useless. [...] The duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act”).

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 27, 2017, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda_____

Case Manager

(313) 234-5113