IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

RONALD COURTS,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.) Civ	vil No. 3:10-1157
) Jud	lge Trauger
WALDEN SECURITY,) Ma	agistrate Judge Bryant
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

On April 17, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 55), to which the plaintiff filed an Objection (Docket No. 61), to which the defendant filed a Response (Docket No. 63).

When a magistrate judge issues a report and recommendation regarding a dispositive pretrial matter, the district court must review *de novo* any portion of the report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001); *Massey v. City of Ferndale*, 7 F.3d 506, 510 (6th Cir. 1993). Objections must be specific; an objection to the report in general is not sufficient, and will result in waiver of further review. *See Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995).

The Objection filed by the plaintiff can only be considered a general objection to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation and does not identify any factual or legal reason why the court should reject the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, which is based upon thorough

and competent analysis of the issues. The plaintiff's Objection appears to simply re-argue the issues before the Magistrate Judge, rather than object to specific findings made by him.

For the reasons expressed herein, the plaintiff's Objection is **OVERRULED**. The Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and made the findings of fact and conclusions of law of this court. For the reasons expressed therein, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the defendant's Motion For Summary Judgment (Docket No. 39) is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. This Order will constitute the final judgment in this case.

It is so **ORDERED.**

Enter this 29th day of May 2012.

ALETA A. TRAUGER U.S. District Judge