

**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)

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. Wigglesworth*, 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