

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

MICHAEL ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEISINGER HOSPITAL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:18-CV-00989

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

ORDER

OCTOBER 3, 2019

1. On May 9, 2018, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendants. ECF No 1.
2. On May 9, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis*. ECF No 2.
3. On November 27, 2018, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle issued a screening order instructing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. ECF No 7. On February 6, 2019, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint. ECF No 11.
4. Plaintiff then filed several other “Complaints” and “Supplements” such that the Court and the named Defendants could not ascertain which document or combination of documents Plaintiff intended to be his Complaint. On June 18, 2019, Magistrate Judge Arbuckle issued an Order directing Plaintiff to file a Third Amended Complaint. ECF No

52. That Order advised Plaintiff that the Third Amended Complaint would completely replace the previously filed complaints and supplements. *Id.*

5. On July 16, 2019, Plaintiff filed his Third Amended Complaint. ECF No 59.
6. In an August 7, 2019 Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Arbuckle recommended that this Court (1) dismiss Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint with prejudice and (2) deny all pending motions in this case as moot. ECF No 98.
7. On August 9, 2019, Plaintiff filed a document styled as an objection to the Report and Recommendation. ECF No 103. However, the document did not provide any specific objections. *See id.*
8. This Court is not required to conduct a *de novo* review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation if no specific objections are made. *See Thomas v Duvall*, 2017 WL 2928153, at *5 (MD Pa July 10, 2017), citing *Goney v Clark*, 749 F2d 5, 6–7 (3d Cir 1984) (stating that a court need not conduct a *de novo* review if objections are not timely or specific because doing so “would undermine the efficiency the magistrate system was meant to contribute to the judicial process”); FRCP 72(b)(2) (“[A] party may serve and file *specific* written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis added).

9. For portions of a report and recommendation to which no proper objection is made, the court should satisfy itself that “there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Thomas*, 2017 WL 2928153 at *2, quoting FRCP 72 (advisory committee notes).
10. This Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Arbuckle’s Report and Recommendation and has determined that there is no clear error on the face of the record.
11. Therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:
 - a. Magistrate Judge Arbuckle’s Report and Recommendation, ECF No 98, is **ADOPTED**;
 - b. Plaintiff’s Third Amended Complaint, ECF No 59, is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**;
 - c. All pending motions in this case (ECF Nos 31, 55, 57, 64, 65, 68, 69, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101) are **DENIED AS MOOT**; and
 - d. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** the case.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann
Matthew W. Brann
United States District Judge