

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

AARON S. JENKINS,

Plaintiff,

v

JOHN M. MCHUGH,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:11-cv-949

HON. JANET T. NEFF

OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Jenkins, a soldier in the United States Army Reserve, initiated the present action, seeking to have a Letter of Reprimand (LOR) removed from his personnel file. Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, and the matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge. Defendant McHugh, Secretary of the Army, moved for summary judgment, and the Magistrate Judge held a motion hearing on May 31, 2012. After consideration of both the oral and written arguments, the Magistrate issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court grant Defendant's motion and dismiss Plaintiff's action (Dkt 33). The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation (Dkts 37, 38), to which Defendant filed a response (Dkt 40).

When objections are received to a magistrate judge's report on a dispositive matter, the district judge "must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The local rules of this Court require that the objecting party "specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings,

recommendations or report to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.” W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b).

While a pro se litigant’s objections should be liberally construed by the Court, *see Boswell v. Mayer*, 169 F.3d 384, 387 (6th Cir. 1999), Plaintiff’s objections wholly fail to reference the Report and Recommendation, let alone state a valid objection to it. Plaintiff’s mere dissatisfaction with the recommended result, without any explanation as to how the Magistrate Judge might have erred in applying the pertinent legal standards or evaluating the decision of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records, cannot serve as a basis for rejecting the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Objections (Dkts 37, 38) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation (Dkt 33) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt 13) is GRANTED.

A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order.

Dated: September 24, 2012

/s/ Janet T. Neff
JANET T. NEFF
United States District Judge