

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

WILLIAM GLEASON,

Plaintiff,

File No. 2:09-CV-110

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

MANUEL CARTER, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On July 14, 2011, United States Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley issued a report and recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that the motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants Anthony Laurin and David Tianen (Dkt. No. 58) be granted. (Dkt. No. 71, R&R.) Plaintiff William Gleason filed objections to the R&R on July 29, 2011. (Dkt. No. 72.)

This Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). “[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) .

In response to the R&R, Plaintiff filed a general response to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff’s response focuses on the conduct of Defendants Carter, Majurin and Cody. Plaintiff has not raised any specific objections to the R&R, and he has not raised any factual issues concerning Defendant Laurin or Tianen. Upon review of the R&R and Plaintiff’s response, it does not appear that there are any factual issues in contention with respect to the conduct of Defendant Laurin or Tianen. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that these defendants are entitled to summary judgment. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the July 14, 2011, R&R (Dkt. No. 71) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants Laurin and Tianen (Dkt. No. 58) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant Laurin and Defendant Tianen are **DISMISSED**.

Dated: August 19, 2011

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