

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

WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
JOHN BULLOCK d/b/a JOHN MEBRATU)	No. 2:13-cv-02933-SHL-cgc
ABYSSINIA BEY,)	
Defendant.)	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, GRANTING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO REMAND, AND DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO
CONSOLIDATE CASES**

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s “Report and Recommendation on Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand, Plaintiff’s Amended Motion to Remand, and Defendant’s Motion to Consolidate Cases” (the “Report and Recommendation”), which was filed on September 26, 2014. (See ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff filed a timely objection to the Report and Recommendation on October 7, 2014. (See ECF No. 12.)

District courts must conduct a *de novo* review of the parts of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a party objects. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, after conducting a *de novo review*, a district court is not required to articulate all of the reasons it rejects a party's objections. Tuggle v. Seabold, 806 F.2d 87, 92 (6th Cir. 1986). This Court has conducted a *de novo* review by reviewing the record before the Magistrate Judge in light of Plaintiff's objections and hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand and Amended Motion to Remand are GRANTED because there is not a federal question and Defendant has not met the amount-in-controversy requirement under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Defendant’s Motion to Consolidate Cases is DENIED as MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 5th day of December, 2014.

/s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE