

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JIMI ROSE,	:	1:13-cv-2056
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	Hon. John E. Jones III
v.	:	
	:	Hon. Martin C. Carlson
YORK COUNTY, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

October 18, 2013

AND NOW, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of Chief United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 14), recommending that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint *Nunc Pro Tunc* (Doc. 13) be denied and the Amended Complaint be dismissed with prejudice, and, after an independent review of the record, it appearing that Plaintiff’s requests for relief are barred by the *Younger* doctrine and the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, and noting that Plaintiff has not filed objections and that there is no clear error on the record,¹ *see Nara v. Frank*, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (explaining that

¹ When parties fail to file timely objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the Federal Magistrates Act does not require a district court to review the report before accepting it. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). As a matter of good practice, however, the Third Circuit expects courts to “afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report.” *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987). The

“failing to timely object to [a report and recommendation] in a civil proceeding may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level”) and the Court finding Judge Carlson’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carlson (Doc. 14) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. Plaintiff’s Motion for leave to file an Amended Complaint *Nunc Pro Tunc* (Doc. 13) is **DENIED**
3. Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** the file on this case.

s/ John E. Jones III
John E. Jones III
United States District Judge

advisory committee notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure indicate that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Henderson*, 812 F.2d at 878-79 (stating that “the failure of a party to object to a magistrate’s legal conclusions may result in the loss of the right to *de novo* review in the district court”); *Tice v. Wilson*, 425 F. Supp. 2d 676, 680 (W.D. Pa. 2006) (holding that the court’s review is conducted under the “plain error” standard); *Cruz v. Chater*, 990 F. Supp. 375-78 (M.D. Pa. 1998) (holding that the court’s review is limited to ascertaining whether there is “clear error on the face of the record”); *Oldrati v. Apfel*, 33 F. Supp. 2d 397, 399 (E.D. Pa. 1998) (holding that the court will review the report and recommendation for “clear error”). The Court has reviewed the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation in accordance with this Third Circuit directive.