

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

HOLICE RYKE MEEKS,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02027-BCL-cgc

**THE VILLAGE AT GERMANTOWN,
CEO MIKE K. CRAFT, and
METHODIST LE BONHEUR HEALTHCARE,**

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Charmiane G. Claxton's Report and Recommendation, entered June 4, 2026. Doc. 144. The Report recommends that Plaintiff Holice Ryke Meeks' Renewed Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 42), his Emergency Motion for Interim Equitable Relief (Doc. 114), and his Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Pleading (Doc. 116) all be denied. Plaintiff had fourteen days after being served to file objections. Plaintiff did not file objections.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of certain 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 non-dispositive orders, the district court “must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the

order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). 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.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The Court has reviewed the Report and the entire record in this matter and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge’s analysis or conclusions. Moreover, the Magistrate Judge warned that:

ANY OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS TO THIS REPORT MUST BE FILED WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THE REPORT. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). FAILURE TO FILE SAID OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS MAY CONSTITUTE A WAIVER AND/OR FORFEITURE OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE OBJECTIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND ANY FURTHER APPEAL.

Doc. 144 at 11. Despite this clear warning, no objections were filed, so Plaintiff forfeited any challenge to the Report. *See Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 150.

Therefore, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 144). Plaintiff Holice Ryke Meeks’ Renewed Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 42) is **DENIED**, his Emergency Motion for Interim Equitable Relief (Doc. 114) is **DENIED**, and his Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Pleading (Doc. 116) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 19th day of June, 2026.

s/Brian C. Lea

BRIAN C. LEA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE