

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

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| DOMINGO VEGA, | : | 1:17-cv-462 |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| v. | : | Hon. John E. Jones III |
| | : | |
| ADAM OAKES, Pennsylvania | : | |
| Board of Probation and Parole Agent, : | | |
| <i>et al.</i> , | : | Hon. Joseph F. Saporito, Jr. |
| Defendants. | : | |

ORDER

April 6, 2017

AND NOW, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) of United States Magistrate Judge Joseph F. Saporito, Jr., recommending that the instant matter be transferred to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, inasmuch as Plaintiff's claims appear to arise out of acts that occurred in Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, which is situated in the Western District, and noting that Plaintiff has not filed objections to the report and that there is and that there is no clear error on the record,¹ *see Nara v. Frank*, 488 F.3d 187,

¹ 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 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

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. 6) of Magistrate Judge Saporito is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. The Clerk of Court shall **TRANSFER** this matter to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.
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

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.