UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

PAUL RAYMOND ROSS,

Plaintiff,

-v- **3:16-CV-1208 (NAM/DJS)**

DEMPSEY UNIFORM AND LINEN SUPPLY; JAMES GREENWALD, Asst. Federal Public Defender; MATTHEW BROWN, Senior U.S. Probation Officer in the Federal Probation Office in Syracuse, NY; DORCAS BRANDON; CRAIG BENEDICT; THOMAS MCAVOY, Federal Court Judge; ROBERT LYONS, FBI Agent; PAUL BOKOL; KRISTEN DEMPSEY O'DONNELL, Vice President of Dempsey Uniform and Linen Supply; THOMAS O'DONNELL, FBI Agent; FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE IN SYRACUSE, NY,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

Paul Raymond Ross
14 Cartwright St. #2
Sidney, NY 13838
Plaintiff, *pro se*

Hon. Norman A. Mordue, Senior U.S. District Judge:

MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER

On October 5, 2016, plaintiff filed a civil rights suit against the above captioned defendants. (Dkt. No. 1). Plaintiff submitted a Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* ("IFP"), which was granted December 13, 2016. (Dkt. Nos. 2, 10). After reviewing the sufficiency of the complaint, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Stewart issued a thorough Report-Recommendation and Order, recommending dismissal of the complaint in its entirety. (Dkt. No. 11). Plaintiff has filed an objection. (Dkt. No. 12).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court reviews *de novo* those parts of the Report-Recommendation to which plaintiff specifically objects. Where, however, an objecting party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates the original arguments, the Court reviews for clear error. *See Farid v. Bouey*, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 307 (N.D.N.Y. 2008). When no objections are made, the Court conducts clear error review. *See Kaboggozamusoke v. Rye Town Hilton Hotel*, 370 F. App'x 246, 248, n.1 (2d Cir. 2010).

Magistrate Judge Stewart addressed plaintiff's claims of conspiracy, malicious abuse of process, tortious interference of contract, and defamation, against all defendants concluding, for various reasons, that they fail to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. In his objection, plaintiff simply states general legal principles, and repeats his allegations against the named defendants. His submissions do not, however, provide any information that would impact the conclusions reached by Judge Stewart in his report-recommendation.

After a thorough review of the report-recommendation, documents submitted by plaintiff, and applicable law, the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Stewart's analysis. Consequently, the Report-Recommendation and Order is adopted in its entirety. In light of the dismissal of the action, the Court denies as moot plaintiff's letter motion for the necessary service forms to be completed (Dkt. No. 3) and for an order of protection (Dkt. No. 8).

It is therefore

ORDERED that the Order and Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 11) of United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Stewart is accepted and adopted; and it is further

ORDERED that this action be DISMISSED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITH PREJUDICE pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)-(iii); and it is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's letter motion (Dkt. No. 3) and letter request (Dkt. No. 8) are

denied as moot; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to serve copies of this Memorandum-Decision and Order in accordance with the Local Rules of the Northern District of New York.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 31, 2017

Norman A. Mordue
Senior U.S. District Judge