UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

TINA L. DAVIS,	:	Case No. 1:14-cv-804
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Timothy S. Black
	:	Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman
vs.	:	
	:	
BUTLER COUNTY SHERIFF, *et al.*,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

DECISION AND ENTRY ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE (Doc. 5)

This case is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division to United States Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings filed with this Court, and, on October 24, 2014, submitted a Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 5). Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 9).[1]

[1] Because these objections were received by the Office of the Circuit Executive on November 26, 2014, the Court construes them as timely filed. *See* November 7, 2014 Notation Order (extending the objection filing deadline to November 26, 2014). Plaintiff appears to object to the Magistrate Judge's finding that Plaintiff has not stated a claim for malicious prosecution under 42 U.S.C. §1983. (Doc. 9 at 5). Plaintiff argues that there was no audio or video evidence of any drug trafficking at the house she owned despite the fact that it was under surveillance, that she was never the target of Officer Hollingsworth's investigation, and that she resided at another address at the time. (*Id.*) This objection is overruled for the reasons articulated in the Report and Recommendation. (*See* Doc. 5 at 5-6). Plaintiff also provides a list of cases and a number of pages from a legal treatise on causes of action and qualified immunity. (Doc. 9 at 12-64). To the extent that these items are intended as objections, they are overruled because they are overly general and fail to dispute any specific portion of the Report and Recommendation. *See Spencer v. Bouchard,* 449 F.3d 721, 725 (6th Cir. 2006) (stating that "[o]verly general objections do not satisfy the objection requirement"), *abrogated on other grounds by Jones v. Bock,* 549 U.S. 199 (2007).

As required by 29 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered *de novo* all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court does determine that the Report and Recommendation should be and is hereby **ADOPTED** in its entirety.

Plaintiff has filed a motion for assistance in obtaining counsel. (Doc. 4). Appointment of counsel in a civil case is not a constitutional right. *Lavado v. Keohane*, 992 F.2d 601, 605-06 (6th Cir. 1993). "It is a privilege that is justified only by exceptional circumstances." *Id.* at 606. The Court finds that such exceptional circumstances do not exist in this case.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons:

1. Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e);
2. Plaintiff's motion for assistance in obtaining counsel (Doc. 4) is **DENIED**; and
3. This civil action is **TERMINATED** in this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 12/8/14

Timothy S. Black
Timothy S. Black
United States District Judge