

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Willis Reitz,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:14-cv-974

W. Wyatt McKay, et al.,

Judge Michael H. Watson

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Magistrate Judge Deavers issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) on October 28, 2014, recommending the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s *pro se* 42 U.S.C. § 1985 suit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. R&R, ECF No. 8. Plaintiff objects to the R&R. Obj., ECF No. 11. For the following reasons, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff’s objections, **ADOPTS** the R&R, and **DISMISSES** the case.


Magistrate Judge Deavers concluded that Plaintiff’s claim was barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) and by the applicable statute of limitations. R&R 5, ECF No. 8.

The R&R advised the parties of their right to file objections, noting any objection must specifically designate the R&R “and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection.” *Id.* at 6.

In his objections, Plaintiff simply reiterates that his conviction was the result of a conspiracy. He does not address the portion of the R&R with which he

objects or the legal basis for his objection. Plaintiff's "objection" cannot be construed as anything other than a general objection, which does not suffice to preserve issues for appeal. See *Howard v. Sec. of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 508–09 (6th Cir. 1991). Because Plaintiff does not contest that his case is barred by *Heck* or the applicable statute of limitations, the Court declines to conduct a *de novo* review of the R&R, **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's objections, **ADOPTS** the R&R, and **DISMISSES** the case for failure to state a claim.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



MICHAEL H. WATSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT