

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

MEL HARTMAN,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2279
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
RANDY COCKER,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	

MEL HARTMAN,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2280
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
STEVEN T. HEINLY,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	

MEL HARTMAN,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2281
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
BRIAN A. WICZKOWSKI,	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	

MEL HARTMAN, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2282**
 :
 Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**
 :
 v. :
 :
 ALEXANDER C. DAMINGER, :
 :
 Defendant :

MEL HARTMAN, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2283**
 :
 Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**
 :
 v. :
 :
 JOSEPH J. AMBROMAITIS, :
 :
 Defendant :

MEL HARTMAN, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2285**
 :
 Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**
 :
 v. :
 :
 WILLIAM E. BENNER, JR., :
 :
 Defendant :

MEL HARTMAN, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2286**
 :
 Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**
 :
 v. :
 :
 ZACHARY V. MEADOR, :
 :
 Defendant :

MEL HARTMAN, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-2287**
: :
Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**
: :
v. : :
: :
CHRISTOPHER R. LAPPLER, : :
: :
Defendant : :

ORDER

AND NOW, this 16th day of February, 2021, upon consideration of the report¹ of Magistrate Judge Joseph F. Saporito, Jr., issued on January 26, 2021, wherein Judge Saporito recommends that the court dismiss the above-captioned actions without prejudice for failure to pay the requisite filing and administrative fees despite being ordered to do so, and it appearing that plaintiff has not objected to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court noting that failure of a party to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a matter of good practice, a district court should afford “reasoned consideration” to the uncontested portions of the report, E.E.O.C. v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting Henderson, 812 F.2d at 879), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory

¹ Judge Saporito’s report appears at Docket Entry No. 5 in the first-filed action, Hartman v. Cocker, No. 1:20-CV-2279, and at Docket Entry No. 4 in all other actions.

committee notes, and, following an independent review of the record, the court agreeing with Judge Saporito's analysis and recommendation, and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Judge Saporito's report is ADOPTED.
2. Plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to pay the requisite filing and administrative fees.
3. The Clerk of Court shall CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
Christopher C. Conner
United States District Judge
Middle District of Pennsylvania