

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
EL DORADO DIVISION

ADAM MASKELL

PLAINTIFF

v.

Case No. 1:24-cv-1005

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE  
QUINCY ROSS

DEFENDANT

**ORDER**

Before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) issued by the Honorable Barry A. Bryant, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Arkansas. ECF No. 5. After screening Plaintiff’s *pro se* Complaint (ECF No. 1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, Judge Bryant recommends that Plaintiff Adam Maskell’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against Defendant Quincy Ross be dismissed with prejudice because Defendant Ross is entitled to judicial immunity.

Plaintiff filed a timely objection. ECF No. 6. However, Plaintiff offers no coherent argument as to why Judge Bryant’s application of judicial immunity to Defendant Ross is incorrect. Plaintiff’s scattered arguments are singularly directed at the alleged actions of a “Judge Puryear,” who is not named as a defendant in this matter. Thus, the Court does not consider Plaintiff’s objection sufficiently specific to require a *de novo* review of Judge Bryant’s R&R. *See Griffini v. Mitchell*, 31 F.3d 690, 692 (8th Cir. 1994) (noting that a specific objection is necessary to require a *de novo* review of a magistrate’s recommendation instead of a review for plain error).

Upon review, finding no clear error on the face of the record and that Judge Bryant’s reasoning is sound, the Court adopts the R&R *in toto*. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Complaint (ECF No. 1) is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** because Defendant Ross is entitled to judicial immunity for all of Plaintiff’s claims.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 26th day of March, 2024.

/s/ Susan O. Hickey  
Susan O. Hickey  
Chief United States District Judge