

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHELLE R. HALLMARK,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 17-13665

Honorable Victoria A. Roberts

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER: (1) OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS [ECF No. 14];**  
**(2) ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF No. 13];**  
**(3) DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [ECF No. 10]; and**  
**(4) GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [ECF No. 12]**

On August 15, 2018, Magistrate Judge Mona K. Majzoub issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that the Court DENY Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and GRANT Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff objects to the R&R.

When a party properly objects to portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the Court reviews such portions *de novo*. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). However, only specific objections that pinpoint a source of error in the report are entitled to *de novo* review. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986). General objections – or those that do nothing more than disagree with a magistrate judge's determination, without explaining the source of the error – have "the same effect[] as would a failure to object." *Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). That is, such objections are not valid, and the Court may treat them

as if they were waived. See *Bellmore-Byrne v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 15-11950, 2016 WL 5219541, at \*1 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 22, 2016) (citing *id.*). Similarly invalid are objections “that merely reiterate[] arguments previously presented, [without] identify[ing] alleged errors on the part of the magistrate judge.” See *id.*

Plaintiff fails to properly object to the R&R. Rather than asserting specific objections, Plaintiff reiterates arguments made previously, without identifying any error made by Magistrate Judge Majzoub.

In her first of two objections, Plaintiff reiterates, word-for-word, an argument she made in her motion for summary judgment; she fails to identify or explain any error the Magistrate Judge made. This objection lacks merit and is waived. See *id.*; *Wallace v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 15-11839, 2016 WL 4409062, at \*2 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 19, 2016) (“Because Plaintiff raises no specific objections to Magistrate Judge Patti’s R&R but merely repeats her brief word for word, Plaintiff has waived any matter therein that might otherwise be cast as an objection.”) (citation and footnote omitted).

Plaintiff’s second objection is similarly deficient. In it, Plaintiff summarily states that the administrative law judge (“ALJ”) and Magistrate Judge misconstrued medical evidence and testimony, and that the Magistrate Judge erred in finding that the ALJ’s decision was supported by substantial evidence. Beyond these conclusory statements disagreeing with the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions, Plaintiff merely reiterates – again, word-for-word – the fact portion of her motion for summary judgment summarizing her impairments, medical history, and limitations. Plaintiff fails to explain what evidence the Magistrate Judge misconstrued or how she misconstrued it, and she does not describe why the Magistrate Judge erred in finding substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s

decision. Plaintiff's second objection fails as a matter of law. See *Bellmore-Byrne*, 2016 WL 5219541, at \*1; *Wallace*, 2016 WL 4409062, at \*2 (“[B]are disagreement with the conclusions reached by the Magistrate Judge, without any effort to identify any specific errors in the Magistrate Judge’s analysis that, if corrected, might warrant a different outcome, is tantamount to an outright failure to lodge objections to the R & R.”) (quoting *Arroyo v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 14-14358, 2016 WL 424939, at \*3 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 4, 2016)).

Plaintiff’s objections are deficient. Nevertheless, after a *de novo* review of the R&R, the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Majzoub’s findings and conclusions. She accurately laid out the facts; she considered the record as a whole; and her conclusions are well reasoned and well supported.

The Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff’s objections and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Majzoub’s R&R.

Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**; Plaintiffs Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED**.

Judgment will enter in favor of Defendant.

**IT IS ORDERED.**

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

Dated: December 27, 2018