

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JERALD THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 1:08-CV-574

v.

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

DAVID A. KOMJATHY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Brenneman’s Report and Recommendation in this matter (docket # 44) and Plaintiff Thomas’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation (docket # 49). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, “[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge’s recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified.” 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997).

Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a de novo determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision, receive further evidence, or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981).

The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Brenneman's Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Brenneman recommends that Defendants Cary and Arnold's Motion for Summary Judgment (docket # 42) be granted. Mr. Thomas objects broadly and generally to "all of the opinions and recommendations" in the Report and Recommendation. (Obj., docket # 49, at 2.) Mr. Thomas does not raise specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, or challenge in any specific way the analysis of the Report and Recommendation. The failure to lodge specific objections is sufficient basis, standing alone, for this Court to adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. *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."). Moreover, in this case the Magistrate Judge's analysis accurately states and applies the law.

Mr. Thomas seeks the opportunity to prove "everything that [he] has alleged in this case." (Obj., docket # 49, at 2.) This request overlooks that in considering Defendants' summary judgment motion, the Magistrate Judge explicitly "accept[ed] the facts as alleged in plaintiff's verified complaint." (Report and Recommendation, docket # 48, at 8.) Opportunity to offer further proof of the facts alleged would have no impact on the analysis.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (docket # 48) is approved and adopted as the opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants Cary and Arnold's Motion for Summary Judgment (docket # 42) is **GRANTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that for the same reasons that the Court dismisses the action, the Court discerns no good-faith basis for an appeal within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997) (overruled on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199 (2007)).

Dated: February 16, 2011

/s/ Robert J. Jonker  
ROBERT J. JONKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE