

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SCOTT PHILLIP LEWIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

8:24-CV-0013
(GTS/DJS)

ONONDAGA COUNTY, NY; and
VILLAGE OF SOLVAY,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

SCOTT PHILLIP LEWIS

Plaintiff, *Pro Se*

1936 Saranac Avenue

#3, PMB 411

Lake Placid, New York 12946

GLENN T. SUDDABY, United States District Judge

DECISION and ORDER

Currently before the Court, in this *pro se* civil rights action filed by Scott Phillip Lewis (“Plaintiff”) against Onondaga County and the Village of Solvay (“Defendants”), is United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Stewart’s Report-Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff’s Complaint be dismissed with leave to amend for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). (Dkt. No. 11.) Plaintiff has not filed an objection to the Report-Recommendation and the time in which to do so has expired. (*See generally* Docket Sheet.)

After carefully reviewing the relevant papers herein, including Magistrate Judge Stewart’s thorough Report-Recommendation, the Court can find no clear error in the Report-

Recommendation:¹ Magistrate Judge Stewart employed the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts. As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons set forth therein.

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Stewart’s Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 11) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in its entirety; and it is further


ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) **shall be DISMISSED with prejudice** and without further Order of this Court **UNLESS**, within **THIRTY (30) DAYS** of entry of this Decision and Order, Plaintiff files an **AMENDED COMPLAINT** that cures the pleading defects identified in the Report-Recommendation; and it is further

ORDERED that, should Plaintiff wish to file an Amended Complaint in this matter, the Amended Complaint must be a complete pleading which will supercede and replace his original Complaint in all respects; and it is further

ORDERED that, should Plaintiff file a timely Amended Complaint, the Amended Complaint be returned to Magistrate Judge Stewart for further review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

¹ 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 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).

Dated: June 4, 2024
Syracuse, New York



Glenn T. Suddaby
U.S. District Judge