

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE**

Musshur Meener v. One Stop Housing, LLC

Meener · No. 2:25-cv-2528-MSN-cgc · Decided February 13, 2026

OPINION

Meener

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

MUSSHUR MEENER,
Plaintiff, v. Case No. 2:25-cv-2528-MSN-cgc
ONE STOP HOUSING, LLC,
Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
DISMISSING MATTER FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE,
DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS AS MOOT,
AND DIRECTING CLERK TO SEND COPIES OF ORDER TO PLAINTIFF

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 13, “Report”) entered on January 14, 2026. On May 27, 2025, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff failed to timely respond, and the Magistrate Judge issued an Order to Show Cause (ECF No. 10) on September 29, 2025, directing Plaintiff to show cause within 14 days why the Court should not grant Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff failed to respond to the Order to Show Cause. Accordingly, the Report recommends that Plaintiff’s Complaint be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. See *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 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