

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN**

Laurie Bishop v. Garland Doyle et al.

No. 2:25-CV-11577-TGB-KGA · No. 2:25-CV-11577-TGB-KGA · Decided January 15, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION LAURIE BISHOP, 2:25-CV-11577-TGB-KGA Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION vs. (ECF NO. 19) GARLAND DOYLE ET AL., Defendants. This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman’s October 21, 2025 Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 19), recommending that Defendants Jocelyn Benson and Dana Nessel’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 5) be granted, that Defendants Tim Greimel, Michael McGuinness, Melanie Rutherford, Garland Doyle, and Deirdre Waterman’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 11) be granted, and that David Coulter, Michael Bouchard, Lisa Brown be sua sponte dismissed.

The Court has reviewed Judge Altman’s Report and Recommendation and finds that it is well-reasoned and supported by the applicable law. The law provides that either party may serve and file written objections “[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy” of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The district court will make a “de novo determination of those portions of the report ... to which objection is made.” *Id.* Where, as here, neither party has lodged objections to the report,¹ the district court is not obligated to independently review the record. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-52 (1985).

The Court will, therefore, accept Judge Altman’s Report and Recommendation of October 21, 2025, as this Court’s findings of fact and conclusions of law. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Judge Altman’s Report and Recommendation of October 21, 2025 (ECF No. 19) is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Jocelyn Benson and Dana Nessel’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 5) is GRANTED and that Defendants Tim Greimel, Michael McGuinness, Melanie Rutherford, Garland Doyle, and Deirdre Waterman’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 11) is GRANTED.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the case is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. ¹ On November 4, 2025, Plaintiff Bishop filed a document titled “Exhibit G — Supplemental Allegations (Final Addendum).” ECF No. 20. The Court is not aware that exhibits designated A-F have been filed on the docket.

The document consists of 10 numbered paragraphs, starting at ¶ 180. Id. at PageID.145. The paragraphs appear to be additional allegations made against Defendants and requests made from the Court. For instance, in one of them “Plaintiff seeks lawful control and redevelopment rights to the Crystal Lake peninsula.” Id. at PageID.144. It does not appear that this document is meant to be an objection to Judge Altman’s Report & Recommendation, nor can it reasonably be construed as such.

The Court finds that the document could be construed as an amendment to the complaint. However, Plaintiff did not request leave to amend her complaint, as is required. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). Thus, the Court directs the Clerk of the Court to STRIKE this ECF No. 20. This is a final order that closes this case. SO ORDERED. Dated: January 15, 2026 /s/Terrence G. Berg HON. TERRENCE G. BERG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Certificate of Service I hereby certify that this Order was electronically filed, and the parties and/or counsel of record were served via electronic and/or ordinary mail.

Dated: January 15, 2026 By: /s/E. Vradenburg Case Manager