

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DOUGLAS ARTHUR
WOLSHLAGER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:21-cv-812

v.

HON. JANET T. NEFF

ART COTTER, et al.,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

This is a civil action brought by a *pro se* plaintiff, Douglas Arthur Wolshlager. The case was referred to the Magistrate Judge who entered a Report and Recommendation on October 29, 2021, recommending that the Court dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the claims in the Complaint are meritless and frivolous (ECF No. 13).

Now before the Court is Plaintiff's "Points and Authorities in Opposition to Demurrer of R and R" (ECF No. 19). The Court treats Plaintiff's filing as an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

The Court is required to review only those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which clear and specific objections are raised. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); *see Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380; *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam); *Weiler v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury-Internal Revenue Serv.*, No. 19-3729, 2020 WL 2528916, at *1 (6th Cir. Apr. 24, 2020) ("De novo review of a magistrate judge's recommendation is required only where the objections filed were not frivolous and only applies to factual disputes."). "[O]bjections disputing the correctness of the

magistrate’s recommendation, but failing to specify the findings believed to be in error are too general and therefore insufficient.” *See Spencer v. Bouchard*, 449 F.3d 721, 725 (6th Cir. 2006), *abrogated on other grounds by Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199 (2007).

The Court finds that Plaintiff does not raise clear, specific, and meritorious objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. After reviewing the Report and Recommendation as well as Plaintiff’s objections and the record, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation is adopted and the objections are denied.

Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 19) are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court **APPROVES** and **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 13) as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Haas and Lee’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 10) is **MOOT**.

Dated: July 5, 2022

/s/ Janet T. Neff

JANET T. NEFF
United States District Judge