

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

CHRISTINE TIMMON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:10-cv-823

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

A'LYNNE ROBINSON,

Defendant.

_____ /

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
APPROVING AND ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 17, 2011, Magistrate Judge Joseph G. Scoville issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff Christine Timmon’s motions for summary judgment (Dkt. Nos. 22, 23) be denied, that Defendant A’Lynne Robinson’s motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 25) be granted with respect to Plaintiff’s federal claim, and that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s state law claim. (Dkt. No. 39.) This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s objection to the R&R. (Dkt. No. 40.)

This Court makes a *de novo* determination of those portions of an R&R to which specific objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). However, “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.”

Miller v. Currie, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995). The Court may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge's findings or recommendations. *Id.*

Plaintiff raises no substantive objection or argument of any kind in her objection. Plaintiff merely issues vague and unsupported allegations of judicial and civic corruption in the state of Michigan which are in no way responsive to the R&R. Indeed, Plaintiff admits that “[she] did not bother [her]self with reading all of the court’s fallacies” (Dkt. No. 40 at 2.) Thus, the Court must examine the R&R without reference to Plaintiff’s objection.

The Court has reviewed this matter and concludes that the R&R correctly analyzes the issues and makes a sound recommendation. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the August 17, 2011, R&R (Dkt. No. 39) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motions for summary judgment (Dkt. Nos. 22, 23) are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant’s motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 25) is **GRANTED** with respect to Plaintiff’s federal claim.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s remaining state law claim is **DISMISSED**, as the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction.

Dated: August 31, 2011

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell
ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE