DICKSON v. VANHOUSEN et al

Case 1:22-cv-01239-GTS-DJS Document 7 Filed 01/23/23 Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SIMONE DICKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

1:22-CV-1239 (GTS/DJS)

VANHOUSEN, Mr. & Mrs., Corr. Officers; REBECCA LAURALIE KIRCHMAN, Corr. Officer; SCHENECTADY COUNTY JAIL; and GANGROM, Corr. Officer,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

SIMONE DICKSON Plaintiff, *Pro Se* 11795 Bowman Towne Drive Reston, Virginia 20190

GLENN T. SUDDABY, United States District Judge

DECISION and ORDER

Currently before the Court, in this *pro se* civil rights action filed by Simone Dickson ("Plaintiff") against Schenectady County Jail and the three above-captioned corrections officers ("Defendants"), is United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Stewart's Report-Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim. (Dkt. No. 6.) Plaintiff has not filed an objection to the Report-Recommendation, and the deadline in which to do so has expired. (*See generally* Docket Sheet.)

After carefully reviewing the relevant filings in this action, the Court finds no clear error in the Report-Recommendation: Magistrate Judge Stewart employed the proper standards,

Doc. 7

When no objection is made to a report-recommendation, the Court subjects that report-recommendation to only a "clear error" review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory

accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts. As a result, the Court accepts and adopts the Report-Recommendation for the reasons stated therein, and Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Stewart's Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 6) is

ACCEPTED and **ADOPTED**; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is **DISMISSED**.

Dated: January 23, 2023

Syracuse, New York

Glenn T. Suddaby U.S. District Judge

Committee Notes: 1983 Addition. When performing such a clear error review, "the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Id.*; *see also Batista v. Walker*, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995) (Sotomayor, J.) ("I am permitted to adopt those sections of [a magistrate judge's] report to which no specific objection is made, so long as those sections are not facially erroneous.") (internal quotation marks omitted).