

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

KEVIN PAUL DOTHARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUE EISEN and VALARIE HAMMOND,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:14-CV-1152

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Kent’s Report and Recommendation in this matter (docket # 33) and Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation (docket # 35). 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 Kent’s Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered the evidentiary record, the parties' arguments, and the governing law. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed Mr. Dothard's claims. Nothing in Mr. Dothard's objections persuades the Court otherwise. Mr. Dothard emphasizes his disagreements with decisions about his medical care, but that is not enough to establish deliberate indifference. *See, e.g., Owens v. Hutchinson*, 79 F. App'x 159, 161 (6th Cir. 2003) ("[a] patient's disagreement with his physicians over the proper medical treatment alleges no more than a medical malpractice claim, which is a tort actionable in state court, but is not cognizable as a federal constitutional claim."). The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that there exists no genuine issues as to material facts and that Defendants are entitled to the relief they seek, for the very reasons the Report and Recommendation delineates.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:**

1. The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (docket # 33) is approved and adopted as the opinion of the Court.
2. The Motions for Summary Judgment filed by defendants Eisen and Hammond (docket ## 11 and 27) are **GRANTED**.
3. 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. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997).

This case is **DISMISSED**.

Dated: March 1, 2016

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