

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

PATRICK L. BUMPUS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 3:19-cv-01081
v.)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
ROBERT HOWARD, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 66, “R & R”), recommending that Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss Defendant Brun [sic] (Doc. No. 60) and Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss Defendants Brunis, Deal, Nilus and Vantell [sic] (Doc. No. 62) be granted.¹ As a result, the Magistrate Judge recommends denying Defendant Bruines’s pending Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 52) as moot. No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at * 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and

¹ The full names (with correct spelling) of the relevant Defendants are as follows: James Deal, f/n/u Nibus, and V. Vontell. The final relevant Defendant is spelled as “Chris Bruines” in the case caption, “Brun” in his Motion to Dismiss, and as “Brunis” or “Brun” in Plaintiff’s filings. The Court believes all of these references to refer to the same Defendant (Chris Bruines, as listed in the case caption) and will refer to him as Defendant Bruines. Plaintiff moved to voluntarily dismiss Defendant Bruines in both motions.

recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendants Bruines, Deal, Nibus, and Vontell are **DISMISSED** without prejudice. Defendant Bruines's Motion to Dismiss is **DENIED** as **MOOT** (Doc. No. 52).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE