

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

MEGAN E. DAWSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 3:23-cv-367-ECM
)	
RUSSELL COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF)	
HUMAN RESOURCES, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION and ORDER

Plaintiff Megan E. Dawson (“Dawson”), proceeding *pro se*, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Alabama state law, claiming that the Defendants violated her constitutional rights and Alabama law arising out of a state court proceeding involving her minor child. On September 4, 2024, the Magistrate Judge entered a Recommendation (doc. 89) that Dawson’s amended complaint be dismissed because it is a quintessential shotgun pleading, and that the Defendants’ motions to dismiss (docs. 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79) be denied as moot. Dawson filed objections to the Recommendation. (Doc. 90). After carefully reviewing the record in this case, the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Dawson’s objections, the Court concludes that Dawson’s objections are due to be overruled, the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is due to be adopted, and this case is due to be dismissed with prejudice.

When a party objects to a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the district court must review the disputed portions *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also*

United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 674 (1980). The district court “may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or resubmit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). *De novo* review requires that the district court independently consider factual issues based on the record. *Jeffrey S. by Ernest S. v. State Bd. of Educ. of State of Ga.*, 896 F.2d 507, 513 (11th Cir. 1990). However, objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation must be sufficiently specific in order to warrant *de novo* review. *See LoConte v. Dugger*, 847 F.2d 745, 750 (11th Cir. 1988) (“Whenever any party files a timely and specific objection to a finding of fact by a magistrate [judge], the district court has an obligation to conduct a *de novo* review of the record with respect to that factual issue.”). Otherwise, a Report and Recommendation is reviewed for clear error.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation, Dawson’s objections, and the entire record in this case. Dawson’s objections amount to general or conclusory objections, which are reviewed for clear error; or restatements of her allegations or arguments already presented and addressed in the Recommendation. While Dawson’s objections reflect a disagreement with the Recommendation’s findings and conclusions, Dawson fails to establish that the Magistrate Judge committed any error. Consequently, her objections are due to be overruled.

Accordingly, upon an independent review of the record, and for good cause, it is

ORDERED as follows:

1. Dawson’s objections (doc. 90) are OVERRULED;

2. The Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. 89) is ADOPTED;
3. This case is DISMISSED with prejudice;
4. All pending motions are DENIED as moot.

A separate Final Judgment will be entered.

DONE this 4th day of November, 2024.

/s/ Emily C. Marks
EMILY C. MARKS
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE