

Musshur Meener v. One Stop Housing, LLC

2001) (citing *Gomez v. United States*, 490 U.S. 858, 869–70 (1989)); see also *Baker v. Peterson*, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). For dispositive matters, “[t]he district judge must determine

de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1).

After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge's proposed findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985).

The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. See *id.* at 151. Objections to any part of a magistrate judge's disposition "must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious." *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); see also *Arn*, 474 U.S. at 147 (stating that the purpose of the rule is to "focus attention on those issues... that are at the heart of the parties' dispute.").

Each objection to the magistrate judge's recommendation should include how the analysis is wrong, why it was wrong, and how de novo review will obtain a different result on that particular issue. See *Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). A general objection, or one that merely restates the arguments previously presented and addressed by the magistrate judge, does not sufficiently identify alleged errors in the report and recommendation.

Id. When an objection reiterates the arguments presented to the magistrate judge, the report and recommendation should be reviewed for clear error. *Verdone v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 16-CV-14178, 2018 WL 1516918, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 28, 2018) (citing *Ramirez v. United States*, 898 F. Supp. 2d 659, 663 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)); *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. Dolgencorp, LLC*, 277 F. Supp. 3d 932, 965 (E.D.

Tenn. 2017). **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION** The Report was entered on January 14, 2026. It notified the parties that that any objections or exceptions to the Report could be filed within 14 days after the party was served with a copy of the Report. It also warned that failure to file objections or exceptions within 14 days may constitute a waiver and/or forfeiture of any objections, exceptions, or further appeal.

The 14-day period has expired, and neither party has filed objections or exceptions. The Court has reviewed the Report for clear error and finds none. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 13) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety, and this matter is **DISMISSED** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 7) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to send a copy of this Order and the Judgment to Plaintiff at the following two addresses: (1) 947 S. Willett Street Memphis, TN 38114, and (2) 211 S. Sheppard

Drive Euless, TX 76040. IT IS SO ORDERED, this 13th day of February, 2026. s/ Mark S. Norris
MARK S. NORRIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-ten/2026/musshur-meener-v-one-stop-housing-llc-txg547ic>