

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

PHILIP E. RAMSEY,	:	1:18-cv-1294
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Hon. John E. Jones III
	:	
ROBERT M. JACKSON d/b/a RMJ	:	Hon. Joseph F. Saporito, Jr.
VETERANS CTR.,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**ORDER**

**February 10, 2020**

**AND NOW**, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 5) of United States Magistrate Judge Joseph F. Saporito, Jr. recommending that this matter be dismissed as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) inasmuch as the sole named defendant is not a state actor and as such Plaintiff cannot maintain a federal civil rights action against it, nor has Plaintiff pled any facts whatsoever that support a claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Court noting the Plaintiff has not filed objections<sup>1</sup> to the instant report, and

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 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*

further noting that there is no clear error on the record, *see Nara v. Frank*, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (explaining that “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 Saporito’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record **IT IS HEREBY**

**ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 5) of Magistrate Judge Saporito is **ADOPTED** as follows.
2. This matter is **DISMISSED** as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
3. 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

---

*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.