

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

PHYLLIS J. LAWRENCE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	NO. 3:21-cv-00031
)	
v.)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
DENIS MCDONOUGH, United States)	
Secretary of Veterans Affairs,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 38, “R&R”), wherein the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant in part and deny in part Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 33). No parties have filed an objection within 14 days as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The failure to properly, specifically, and timely 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). “The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object. Moreover, an objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate’s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an objection as that term is used in this context.” *Id.* at *2 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and 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.*

Accordingly, the R&R (Doc. No. 38) is ADOPTED. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 33) is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE