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

JEROME JUNIOR WASHINGTON,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 19 – 1462
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	District Judge Joy Flowers Conti
	)	Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan
MS. WRIGHT, *et al*.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Currently pending before the Court are the Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") filed by Jerome Junior Washington ("Plaintiff") and the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") that recommends the Motion be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (ECF Nos. 1 & 2.) Specifically, the magistrate judge found that Plaintiff has filed at least three actions in federal court that were dismissed as either frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and she concluded that Plaintiff cannot proceed IFP in this action pursuant to section 1915(g) because he was not in imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time he filed his Complaint. *See* (ECF No. 2.) Plaintiff was served with the R&R and filed timely objections to it on November 26, 2019. (ECF No. 3.)

When a party objects to an R&R, the district court must review *de novo* those portions of the R&R to which objection is made. *See* United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 673 (1980); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). To obtain *de novo* review, however, a party must clearly and specifically identify those portions of the R&R to which it objects. Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 6-7 (3d Cir.

1984). The district court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations made by the magistrate judge. Raddatz, 447 U.S. at 673-74.

Here, Plaintiff states that he "should have the same rights as the rich in the court of law under its fairness and jurisdiction . . ." and that the defendants (presumably in his other cases) are deceiving this court into believing that his allegations are "untruthful and dishonest." (ECF No. 3, p.1.) Even if the court assumed that Plaintiff's objection triggered *de novo* review, which it certainly does not, the court need not disturb the magistrate judge's conclusions. The record shows that Plaintiff has accumulated at least three strikes and that he was not in imminent danger of serious physical injury. Furthermore, since the filing of the R&R in this case, Plaintiff accumulated another strike with the dismissal of Washington v. Gilmore, No. 18-1558 (W.D. Pa.) on November 22, 2019. An appropriate order will be entered.

By the court:

/s/ JOY FLOWERS CONTI
Joy Flowers Conti
Senior United States District Judge

Cc: Jerome Junior Washington
HV-0282
SCI Greene
175 Progress Drive
Waynesburg, PA 15370