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

JEFFREY D. HILL, Plaintiff, v. SCOTT PERRY, Defendant.	No. 4:22-CV-00560 (Chief Judge Brann) (Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

ORDER

AUGUST 2, 2022

Plaintiff filed the instant action on April 18, 2022, and it was jointly assigned to the undersigned and to a magistrate judge. Upon designation, a magistrate judge may "conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations."[1] Once filed, this report and recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.[2]

On April 26, 2022, United States Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle, to whom this matter is jointly assigned, issued a thorough report and recommendation recommending that Hill's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* be granted and this case be dismissed without leave to amend pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

[1] 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).
[2] 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed. Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.[3] Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.[4]

Because the Court writes solely for the parties, it will not restate the facts, but will instead adopt the recitation of facts as set forth by the magistrate judge. The Court has conducted a de novo review here and found no error, clear or otherwise. Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 5) is **ADOPTED**.
2. Hill's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is **GRANTED**.
3. Hill's complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

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

---

[3] Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

[4] 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.