UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EDDIE CURTIS LUCAS, JR. Plaintiff, v. MEJIA FRANCISCO & ERIC PIPENBRINK, Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-CV-01172 (MEHALCHICK, J.)

ORDER

Plaintiff Eddie Lee Curtis Lucas ("Plaintiff") filed this lawsuit against Mejia Francisco and Eric Pipenbrink (collectively, "Defendants") along with a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on July 1, 2024. (Doc. 1). The case was transferred to this Court from the Western District of Pennsylvania on July 16, 2024. (Doc. 2; Doc. 10, at 1). On August 8, 2024, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis.* (Doc. 7). Judge Arbuckle subsequently screened the complaint in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed without leave to amend. (Doc. 10). No objections have been filed to the Report. As such, the Court will **ADOPT** the Report and Recommendation.

"A district court may 'designate a magistrate judge to conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and to submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations for the disposition' of certain matters pending before the court." *Brown v. Astrue*, 649 F.3d 193, 195 (3d Cir. 2011) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)). Within fourteen days of being served a report and recommendation, "any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court." 28

U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When a party timely files objections, the district court is to conduct a *de novo* review of the challenged portions of the Magistrate Judge's findings unless the objection is "not timely or not specific." *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 6–7 (3d Cir.1984); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may then "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). "Although the standard is *de novo*, the extent of review is committed to the sound discretion of the district judge, and the court may rely on the recommendations of the magistrate judge to the extent it deems proper." *Rahman v. Gartley*, No. CV 3:23-363, 2024 WL 555894, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 12, 2024) (citing *United v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 676 (1980)). For those sections of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Fed. R. Civ. P. Adv. Comm. Note Rule 72(b).

The Court agrees with the sound reasoning in Judge Arbuckle's Report and finds no clear error on the face of the record. (Doc. 10). **NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the Report of Judge Arbuckle (Doc. 10) is **ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY** as the decision of the Court. Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED.** (Doc. 1). Clerk shall mark this matter **CLOSED.**

BY THE COURT:

Date: March 10, 2025

s/ Karoline Mehalchick
KAROLINE MEHALCHICK
United States District Judge