

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Julia Janney,

Case No. 3:13CV399

Plaintiff

v.

ORDER

Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant

In this appeal, I review defendant Commissioner of Social Security’s (Commissioner) decision denying Julia Janney’s claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 416(I), 423, 1381 *et seq.* Magistrate Judge Kathleen B. Burke reviewed the decision and recommends that I affirm the final decision of the Commissioner and dismiss Janney’s claim. (Doc. 18).

Plaintiff has filed a document titled “Plaintiff’s Objections to Magistrate [sic] Report and Recommendation” (Doc. 19) in which she copied and pasted verbatim her arguments from her brief on the merits. (Doc. 15).

Plaintiff’s pleading does not satisfy the requirements for an objection. Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), a party must file “specific written objections” to trigger *de novo* review by the district court. The Supreme Court explained the purpose of this requirement, stating “[t]he filing of objections to a magistrate’s report enables the district judge to focus attention

on those issues – factual and legal – that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985).

The Sixth Circuit has noted that “objections must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Curie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995). A party’s failure to file specific objections is a waiver of those objections. *Cowherd v. Million*, 380 F.3d 909, 912 (6th Cir. 2004). Thus, “parties who fail to make specific objections do so at their own peril.” *Id.*

Because plaintiff raises no specific objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation but merely repeats her brief word for word, I find that plaintiff has waived those objections. *See Hawkins v. Astrue*, 2010 WL3221855, *1 (W.D. Ky.) (dismissing plaintiff’s objections to magistrate’s report and recommendation because she simply copied and pasted the contents of her brief). I also find that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is thorough, well-reasoned, and correct.

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby:

ORDERED THAT

1. Plaintiff’s objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19) be, and the same hereby are overruled; and
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 18) be, and the same hereby is adopted as the order of this court.

So ordered.

/s/ James G. Carr
Sr. United States District Judge