

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Nevin P. Cooper-Keel v. Jeremy Baier, et al.

Cooper-Keel · No. 1:24-cv-1235 · Decided March 24, 2026

OPINION

Cooper-Keel

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NEVIN P. COOPER-KEEL,

Plaintiff, Case No. 1:24-cv-1235 v.

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

JEREMY BAIER, et al., Defendants. _____/

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Nevin P. Cooper-Keel, proceeding pro se, initiated this action against Defendants Jeremy Baier, an Allegan County assistant prosecutor; and Carter Woodwyk, a Michigan Department of Natural Resources officer. Plaintiff alleges malicious prosecution and due process violations arising from a misdemeanor charge that was brought against him but subsequently dismissed. Defendant Baier was previously dismissed from this action. Defendant Woodwyk filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, which was fully briefed and referred to the Magistrate Judge. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court grant the motion and close this case. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation, to which Woodwyk filed a response. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies the objections. The Magistrate Judge thoroughly considered the factual allegations that Plaintiff supplied in support of his claims, concluding that neither claim was plausibly alleged (R&R, ECF No. 39 at PageID.414–416). In his objections, Plaintiff reiterates his arguments that his factual allegations were sufficient to support his claims (Objs., ECF No. 40 at PageID.421–424). As Defendant Woodwyk points out (Resp., ECF No. 41 at PageID.427), Plaintiff states merely a “wholesale objection” to the Magistrate Judge's conclusions, which is insufficient for meaningful review by the Court. See, e.g., *Freeman v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 972 F.2d 347, at *2 (6th Cir. 1992) (“[The] purpose [of filing objections] is not served if the district court is required to conduct a complete, de novo review of

all of the pleadings that were considered by the magistrate judge.”). In sum, Plaintiff’s objections do not reveal any error in the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order. See FED. R. CIV. P. 58. Consistent with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation, the Court certifies that an appeal of the Judgment would not be taken in good faith. Therefore: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Objections (ECF No. 40) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 39) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Woodwyk’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 15) is GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Court certifies that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith. Dated: March 24, 2026 /s/ Jane M. Beckering

JANE M. BECKERING

United States District Judge