



## Bey v. Rhodes College

2024 | Cited 0 times | W.D. Tennessee | February 22, 2024

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

WESTERN DIVISION

VERRINA BEY,

Plaintiff,

v. ) No. 2:23-2065-SHM-cgc

RHODES COLLEGE,

Defendant.

ORDER

Before the Court (the See ECF No. 10. See ECF No. 14. The Magistrate

I. Background Plaintiff Verrina Bey believes that all COVID-19 vaccines development, See ECF No. 1, ¶ 1. Plaintiff says that being vaccinated with these COVID-19 vaccines is antithetical to her religious beliefs. Id. College, required its employees to be vaccinated against COVID- 19. Id. ¶¶ 8, 12. Plaintiff refused to be vaccinated, and Defendant subsequently discharged See id. ¶¶ 1, 14.

In Count I, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated right to the free exercise of her religion, which is secured under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment through the Fourteenth Amendment. Id. ¶¶ 17 33. In Count II, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated right to equal protection of the laws, which is secured by the Fourteenth Amendment. Id. ¶¶ 34 46. In Count III, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff . . . in violation of

] own policies and Title IX. Id. ¶ 47 48. In Count IV, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant may be held vicariously liable for the discriminatory and retaliatory actions of its employees. Id. ¶ 49.

Defendant has filed a Motion to Dismiss Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure



## Bey v. Rhodes College

2024 | Cited 0 times | W.D. Tennessee | February 22, 2024

12(b)(6).

See ECF No. 10. United States Magistrate Judge Charmiane Claxton filed the Report on November 13, 2023, recommending that the See ECF No. 14. Plaintiff has filed timely objections to the Report. See ECF No. 15. Defendant has not responded. II. Jurisdiction

jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(a).

### III. Standard of Review

de novo determination of those

findings or recommendations to which objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the

Id. a de novo or any other standard, those aspects of the report and *Canaday v. Anthem Cos., Inc.*, 439 F. Supp. 3d 1042, 1045 (W.D. Tenn. 2020) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)). filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet

the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a *Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. App'x 228, 230 (6th Cir.2009). An objecting party must point to *Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505,

509 (6th Cir.1991). IV. Analysis

Plaintiff has failed to make any specific objections to the Report. no attempt to address the Report

For example, Plaintiff says that the Magistrate Judge committed consent to amend the VERRINA BEY Estate Trust was lawfully

attained where [the Magistrate Judge] had actual knowledge that the validity and lawfulness of this case was a fact in dispute . See ECF No. 15. Plaintiff also alleges, without offering any analysis, that Defendant violated Titles V, VI, and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, violated The Highway Safety Act of 1966, and violated the National Drivers Act of 1982. See *id.*

are not specific objections to the Report . The Court need not review under a de novo or any other standard *Canaday*, 439 F. Supp. 3d at 1045. The Report is adopted in full.

### V. Conclusion

SO ORDERED this 22nd day of February, 2024.



## Bey v. Rhodes College

2024 | Cited 0 times | W.D. Tennessee | February 22, 2024

/s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr. SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

