

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JAMES V. WARD, III,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:24-cv-364
v.)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
CITY OF LANSING, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on plaintiff's objection to Judge Green's report and recommendation. (ECF No. 47). Judge Green issued a report and recommendation dismissing this case for lack of prosecution and because plaintiff failed to respond to defendants' motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 44). The court will adopt the report and recommendation over plaintiff's objection.

I.

Plaintiff sued nearly a dozen defendants following his arrest and incarceration in 2021. (ECF No. 1). Those defendants moved to dismiss his complaint. (ECF No. 14). Plaintiff failed to file a response. The court entered an order directing plaintiff to file a response. (ECF No. 42). Plaintiff failed to do so. The court had expressly cautioned that plaintiff's failure to file a response would result in his waiver as well as dismissal of his case. (ECF No. 42). The R&R recommends granting defendants' motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, dismissal for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 44). After the R&R was filed, this court granted

plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file objections to the R&R. (ECF No. 46). Plaintiff timely filed his objections. (ECF No. 47).

II.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam).

III.

Plaintiff's objections plainly fail to address the R&R. Plaintiff does not explain why he failed to address defendants' motion to dismiss or why his action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Accordingly, Plaintiff's filing is not a proper objection, and this court will reject it.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the report and recommendation (ECF No. 44) is **ADOPTED** by the court. This case is dismissed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's objection to the report and recommendation (ECF No. 47) is **DENIED**.

Judgment to follow.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 10, 2025

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge