

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

Williams v. Melvin, Blalock, and Winter

Williams · No. 2:23-cv-12868 · Decided March 9, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION HENRY WILLIAMS, Case No. 2:23-cv-12868 Plaintiff, Hon. Brandy R. McMillion v. United States District Judge ANTONIO MELVIN, ANDREW Hon. Anthony P. Patti BLALOCK, and ROBERT WINTER United States Magistrate Judge Defendants.
_____/ ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF NO. 31), GRANTING DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF NO. 26) Plaintiff Henry Williams (“Williams”) filed this pro se prisoner civil rights case against Sergeant Antonio Melvin, Officer Andrew Blalock, and Officer Robert Winter (collectively, “Defendants”).

See generally ECF Nos. 1, 6. Williams alleges that Defendants violated his constitutional rights during a strip-search. ECF No. 6. This matter was originally assigned to the Honorable Mark Goldsmith, but reassigned to the undersigned in April, 2024. See Administrative Order 24-AO-007.

The case was referred to Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti for all pretrial matters. ECF No. 17. On May 29, 2025, Defendants moved for summary judgment based on Williams’s failure to prove any personal involvement of Sergeant Melvin, because the Fourth Amendment does not apply in the context of searches relating to a legitimate penological interest, and government officials performing discretionary functions are shielded from civil damages.

See generally ECF No. 26. On February 9, 2026, Magistrate Judge Patti issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that the Court grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 31. At the end of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties that to seek review of his recommendation, they had to file specific objections with the Court within 14 days of service of the R&R.

Id. at PageID.196-197. As of the date of this Order, March 9, 2026—31 days since the Magistrate Judge issued the R&R—neither party has filed objections to the R&R or contacted the Court to ask for more time to file objections.

The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); see also *Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 957-

58 (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that a party's failure to timely object to a report and recommendation allows a court to accept the recommendation "without expressing any views on the merits of the magistrate's conclusions").

Similarly, failure to object to an R&R forfeits any further right to appeal. See *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019) (recognizing that a party forfeits their right to appeal by failing to timely file objections to an R&R).

Accordingly, because neither party objected to the R&R, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of Defendants' Motion is ADOPTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 26) is GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all claims in this action are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 9, 2026 s/Brandy R. McMillion Detroit, Michigan HON. BRANDY R. MCMILLION United States District Judge