

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

Fredrick Ledell Buford v. Jeffrey S. Getting, et al.

No. 1:25-CV-1657, United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
(January 13, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan approved and adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff Fredrick Ledell Buford’s complaint. The court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), found no good-faith basis for appeal, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. Jonker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-1657
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), along with Plaintiff's objections, and conducted de novo review of the objected-to matters.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a proper objection was made, including at least a review of the evidence before the magistrate judge.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge's report and recommendation after de novo review of Plaintiff's objections.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
3. Whether the plaintiff had a good-faith basis for appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

HOLDINGS

1. When a party properly objects to portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court must determine de novo the objected-to portions and may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition.
2. The complaint failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted and was properly dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
3. The court found no good-faith basis for an appeal.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a civil-rights complaint filed by Fredrick Ledell Buford against Jeffrey S. Getting and other defendants. The magistrate judge reviewed the complaint and governing law and recommended dismissal for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The district court found the recommendation factually sound and legally correct and concluded that Plaintiff's objections did not meaningfully address the magistrate judge's analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Berens issued a report and recommendation recommending dismissal of the complaint for failure to state a claim under the prisoner-screening statute. Plaintiff objected. The district court reviewed the evidence, the report and recommendation, and the objections de novo, approved and adopted the recommendation, dismissed the complaint, declined to find a good-faith basis for appeal, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Hill v. Duriron Co., 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981)
- McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997)

OPINION

Getting

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

FREDRICK LEDELL BUFORD,

Plaintiff,

CASE No. 1:25-CV-1657

v.

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

JEFFREY S. GETTING, et al., Defendants. _____/

ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Berens' Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) and Plaintiff's Objection to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 7). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, "[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge's recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified." 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that: The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct. The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted under the screening mechanism of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Plaintiff's objections fail to deal in a meaningful way with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered the record and the governing law. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed the law. Nothing in Plaintiff's Objections changes the fundamental analysis. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's Complaint must be dismissed for the very reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 6) is APPROVED AND ADOPTED as the opinion of the Court. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Court discerns no good-faith basis for appeal of this matter. See *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114

F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). This case is CLOSED. Dated: January 13, 2026 /s/ Robert J. Jonker

ROBERT J. JONKER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2