

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

James Harry Hebert Bordages, Jr. v. WMC-TV, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-02615-TLP-atc · No. No. 2:25-cv-02615-TLP-atc · Decided March 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismissed James Harry Hebert Bordages, Jr.’s complaint with prejudice. The court concluded that the allegations of a conspiracy involving unauthorized surveillance were vague, baseless, and frivolous, and it denied the motion for a temporary restraining order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas L. Parker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
DECIDED	March 19, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-02615-TLP-atc
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and denial of a temporary restraining order. Plaintiff filed objections, which the district court found insufficiently specific, reviewed the R&R for clear error, adopted it, dismissed the claims with prejudice, and denied the motion for a temporary restraining order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When a party fails to make specific objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court may review the recommendation for clear error rather than de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	James Harry Hebert Bordages, Jr. v. WMC-TV, et al.

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

section 1983

civil procedure

injunctions

civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's general objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation required de novo review.
2. Whether the complaint's vague and frivolous surveillance allegations supported subject matter jurisdiction and stated a viable basis for relief.
3. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the complaint and deny a temporary restraining order should be adopted.

HOLDINGS

1. Objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation must be specific; vague, general, or conclusory objections do not identify issues for de novo review, allowing the district court to review the recommendation for clear error.
2. The court adopted the recommendation that the complaint's vague, nebulous, baseless, and frivolous allegations did not support federal subject matter jurisdiction and warranted dismissal with prejudice.
3. The district court found no clear error, adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, dismissed Plaintiff's claims with prejudice, and denied his motion for a temporary restraining order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Courts in the Sixth Circuit uniformly find these kinds of claims to be frivolous and dismiss them out of hand for lack of subject matter jurisdiction during the § 1915(e) screening process." (PageID 85)

"Overly general objections do not satisfy the objection requirement."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bordages alleged that WMC-TV, WREG-TV, and other defendants participated in a multiyear surveillance operation involving interception of communications, monitoring of his residence, and observation of his physical and biological activity. He asserted claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986, along with claims described as obstruction of justice and international legal interference. The complaint sought an injunction against the alleged surveillance and \$100 billion in damages, but the court found the allegations vague, baseless, and frivolous.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se complaint alleging that unknown individuals and media companies conspired to violate his constitutional rights through unauthorized surveillance, and he sought injunctive relief and damages. The case was referred to Magistrate Judge Annie T. Christoff, who recommended dismissal and denial of the

requested temporary restraining order. Plaintiff objected, but the district court concluded that his objections did not identify specific errors, found no clear error, adopted the R&R, dismissed the action with prejudice, and denied the temporary restraining order.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Spencer v. Bouchard, 449 F.3d 721, 725 (6th Cir. 2006)
- Miller v. Currie, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995)
- Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199 (2007)
- Solomon v. Michigan Department of Corrections, 478 F. App'x 318, 320 (6th Cir. 2012)
- Slater v. Potter, 28 F. App'x 512, 513 (6th Cir. 2002)
- Carter v. Mitchell, 829 F.3d 455, 472 (6th Cir. 2016)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985)
- Howard v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991)
- Robert v. Tesson, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007)
- Burnes v. Clinton, 238 F.3d 419, at *1 (6th Cir. 2000)
- Huey v. Raymond, 53 F. App'x 329, 330 (6th Cir. 2002)
- Martin v. Kazulkina, No. 12-cv-14286, 2017 WL 971706, at *16 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2017)
- Corwin v. CIA, No. 22-cv-12694, 2023 WL 12176998, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 21, 2023)
- Lawson v. City of Youngstown, No. 4:16-cv-1057, 2016 WL 2868715, at *2 (N.D. Ohio May 17, 2016)
- Walker v. City of Memphis, No. 2:15-cv-2340-JDT-tmp, 2015 WL 3852846, at *3 (W.D. Tenn. May 28, 2015)
- Phillips v. Biden, No. 2:22-cv-61, 2022 WL 2309148, at *2 (E.D. Tenn. June 9, 2022)
- Shephard v. Department of Veterans Affairs, No. 1:21-cv-1012, 2022 WL 21295049, at *3 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 24, 2022)
- Bordages II, 2015 WL 9267086, at *1 n.1 (W.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2015)

OPINION

Bordages

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

WESTERN DIVISION

JAMES HARRY HEBERT BORDAGES,)

JR.,)) Plaintiff,)) No. 2:25-cv-02615-TLP-atc v.)) WMC-TV, et al.,)) Defendants.)

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS

COMPLAINT

Pro se Plaintiff James Harry Hebert Bordages, Jr., sued many unknown individuals and media companies in June 2025, alleging a conspiracy to violate his constitutional rights through unauthorized surveillance. (See ECF No. 1.) Under Administrative Order No. 2013-05, this Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge Annie T. Christoff to manage all pretrial matters. Judge Christoff issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) in January 2026 recommending that the Court dismiss the Complaint and deny Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order. (ECF No. 19.) Her R&R notified both parties that they had 14 days to object to the R&R. Plaintiff objected. (ECF No. 20.) In the R&R, Judge Christoff recommends dismissing Plaintiff’s Complaint and denying his Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 19.) For the reasons below, this Court ADOPTS the R&R.

BACKGROUND AND THE R&R

Plaintiff sued here in June 2025. (ECF No. 1.) He also moved for other relief, including a temporary restraining order. (See ECF Nos. 3–17.) In her R&R, Judge Christoff noted that Plaintiff is a frequent litigant in this Court and has repeatedly sued alleging grandiose, vague, and frivolous conspiracies against many individuals and entities. (ECF No. 19.) This case is no different.

LEGAL STANDARD

A magistrate judge may submit to a district court judge proposed findings of fact and recommendations for deciding pretrial matters. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B). And “[w]ithin 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If the parties do not object, the district court reviews the R&R for clear error. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes. And the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Objections must be “specific.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “Overly general objections do not satisfy the objection requirement.” *Spencer v. Bouchard*, 449 F.3d 721, 725 (6th Cir. 2006) (citing *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995)), abrogated on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199 (2007); see also *Solomon v. Michigan Dep’t of Corr.*, 478 F. App’x 318, 320 (6th Cir. 2012). So when a plaintiff submits only vague, general, or conclusory objections, the district court may review the R&R for clear error, rather than de novo. See *Slater v. Potter*, 28 F. App’x 512, 513 (6th Cir. 2002); see also *Carter v. Mitchell*, 829 F.3d 455, 472 (6th Cir. 2016) (“In general, ‘the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate[] [judge’s] report constitutes a waiver of those objections.’” (citation omitted)). These limits on objections support judicial economy. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985) (“The Sixth Circuit’s decision to require the filing of objections is supported by sound considerations of judicial economy.”). Raising specific objections enables district courts to “focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.” *Id.*; see *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991) (explaining that a “general objection to

the entirety of a magistrate's report has the same effects as a failure to object" because it does not focus the district court's "attention . . . on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the magistrate useless"); see also *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) ("[T]his Court has held that an objection preserves an issue when it 'explains and cites specific portions of the report which counsel deems problematic.'" (citation omitted)). With that in mind, the Court turns to Plaintiff's objections. Judge Christoff entered her R&R on January 13, 2025. Plaintiff objected, but he failed to assert specific problems with the merits of Judge Christoff's recommendation. (ECF No. 20.) His objections focus on Judge Christoff's references to his other frivolous lawsuits, stating that she improperly relied on facts and allegations from other lawsuits in recommending dismissal here. (Id.) But Plaintiff is mistaken. Judge Christoff was only referring to the history of frivolous lawsuits to provide context for this Complaint. Plaintiff's objections reveal that he misunderstands these background references as being essential for her recommendation. Because he alleges no specific problem with the R&R, the Court reviews the R&R for clear error.

DISPOSITION

Having reviewed the record, the Court finds no clear error in Judge Christoff's R&R. In fact, the Court agrees with her well-reasoned analysis. Judge Christoff correctly notes that "[c]ourts in the Sixth Circuit uniformly find these kinds of claims to be frivolous and dismiss them out of hand for lack of subject matter jurisdiction during the § 1915(e) screening process." (ECF No. 19 at PageID 85 (citing *Burnes v. Clinton*, 238 F.3d 419, at *1 (6th Cir. 2000); *Huey v. Raymond*, 53 F. App'x 329, 330 (6th Cir. 2002); *Martin v. Kazulkina*, No. 12-cv14286, 2017 WL 971706, at *16 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2017); *Corwin v. CIA*, No. 22-cv-12694, 2023 WL 12176998, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 21, 2023); *Lawson v. City of Youngstown*, No. 4:16-cv-1057, 2016 WL 2868715, at *2 (N.D. Ohio May 17, 2016); *Walker v. City of Memphis*, No. 2:15- cv-2340-JDT-tmp, 2015 WL 3852846, at *3 (W.D. Tenn. May 28, 2015), report and recommendation adopted, 2015 WL 3851994 (W.D. Tenn. June 22, 2015); *Phillips v. Biden*, No. 2:22-cv-61, 2022 WL 2309148, at *2 (E.D. Tenn. June 9, 2022), report and recommendation adopted, 2022 WL 2307614 (E.D. Tenn. June 27, 2022); *Shephard v. Dep't of Veterans Affs.*, No. 1:21-cv-1012, 2022 WL 21295049, at *3 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 24, 2022)).) Bordages has filed over a dozen lawsuits in the Western District of Tennessee since 2012. The first suit (Case No. 2:12-cv-02060-JDT-dkv, "Bordages I") and second suit (Case No. 2:15- cv-02708-STA-atc, "Bordages II") alleged that SportsClips, various governmental agencies, healthcare providers, and media companies "conspired to plant a chip in Bordages's scalp during a routine haircut" in April 2010. *Bordages II*, 2015 WL 9267086, at *1 n.1 (W.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2015), report and recommendation adopted, 2015 WL 9295994 (W.D. Tenn. Dec. 18, 2015). Both suits were dismissed as frivolous. (ECF No. 19 at PageID 79.) In fact, all the cases that Bordages has filed, that are not pending, have been dismissed as frivolous. (Id.) Bordages alleges here that he "has been subjected to increasing and unlawful surveillance originating from media outlets, including WMC-TV and WREG-TV, operating in Memphis" and that "[t]his surveillance includes the interception of private communications, monitoring of Plaintiff's

residence, and the unauthorized observation and analysis of Plaintiff's physical and biological activity through covert electronic means." (ECF No. 1, at PageID 2.) As Judge Christoff notes, it is unclear whether the Complaint here relates to the chip allegedly implanted in his scalp by SportsClips in 2010 or if it is a separate scheme to surveille him. (ECF No. 19 at PageID 79.) This is because the Complaint is "extremely vague, nebulous, and difficult to follow." (Id.) Bordages alleges only that the surveillance occurs "[o]ver several years" and vaguely contends that Defendants here "coordinated with other corporate entities, some acting under color of state or federal authority, to engage in an organized campaign of electronic intrusion, communication interference, and reputational sabotage." (ECF No. 1 at PageID 3.) Bordages sues under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986 and for "obstruction of justice and international legal interference" because of Defendants alleged "access to intimate, detailed personal and biological information" from their sophisticated surveillance operation functioning beyond the scope of protected media activity." (Id. at PageID 3–4.) Bordages requests an injunction prohibiting the alleged remote surveillance and control and \$100 billion in damages. (Id. at 4.) With the above in mind, the Court agrees with Judge Christoff that Plaintiff's allegations are vague, baseless, and frivolous. And having found no clear error, the Court therefore ADOPTS the R&R to dismiss this action.

CONCLUSION

The Court has reviewed Judge Christoff's R&R and finds no clear error. And so the Court ADOPTS the R&R. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's Claims WITH PREJUDICE and DENIES his Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order. SO ORDERED, this 19th day of March, 2026. s/Thomas L. Parker

THOMAS L. PARKER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE