

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LONNIE BAKER,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No.
11-CV-14086

vs.

HON. MARK A. GOLDSMITH

LNV CORPORATION,

Defendant.
_____/

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, OVERRULING
PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTIONS, and GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

This matter is presently before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Paul J. Komives, issued on June 25, 2013 (Dkt. 29). The Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendant’s motion to dismiss (Dkt. 23) be granted. Plaintiff has filed objections to the R&R (Dkt. 30) and Defendant has filed a response (Dkt. 31). The Court reviews de novo those portions of the R&R to which an objection has been made. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

While Plaintiff has filed objections to the R&R, they are all conclusory, nonsensical, or incoherent. To the extent that the objections are comprehensible, they do not address the specific reasoning of the Magistrate Judge or the authorities on which the Magistrate Judge relies. Therefore, the objections are overruled. See Cowherd v. Million, 380 F.3d 909, 912 (6th Cir. 2004) (“Generally, the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate’s report constitutes a waiver of those objections.”); 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 enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.”).

In any event, the Court has reviewed the R&R and believes that the Magistrate Judge properly concludes that Defendant’s motion to dismiss should be granted based on Plaintiff’s failure to make sufficient allegations of fact in support of his claims. Because the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that the allegations in the complaint do not contain sufficient facts in support of Plaintiff’s various claims, the Court need not address the other specific legal conclusions reached by the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s objections are overruled and Defendant’s motion to dismiss (Dkt. 23) is granted.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 25, 2013
Flint, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith
MARK A. GOLDSMITH
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on July 25, 2013.

s/Deborah J. Goltz
DEBORAH J. GOLTZ
Case Manager