

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION**

KIMBERLY MICHELLE WARE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	No. 1:17-cv-01088-STA-egb
)	
STATE OF TENNESSEE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND DISMISSING THE *PRO SE* COMPLAINT

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 20) of United States Magistrate Judge Edward G. Bryant (the “Magistrate Judge”) as to the *pro se* Complaint (ECF No. 1) of Plaintiff Kimberly Michelle Ware (“Plaintiff”). The Magistrate Judge filed his Report and Recommendation on November 17, 2017. When a magistrate judge “submit[s] to a judge of the [district] court proposed findings of fact and recommendations,” “any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)–(C). Any such objection must be made within fourteen days. *Id.* § 636(b)(1). Then the Court “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* (italics added). But the Court need not review any portion of the recommendation to which Plaintiff did not specifically object, and may adopt the findings and rulings of the Chief Magistrate Judge to which no specific objection is filed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–52 (1985).

Here, Plaintiff has not filed an objection any part of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. And the time for Plaintiff to do so has passed. Therefore, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Recommendation and Report of the Magistrate Judge in full. Accordingly, Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint is **DISMISSED**. All pending motions are **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: December 4, 2017.