

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

Bruce R. Norton v. Joseph Adams, et al.

Norton · No. 1:25-CV-01216 · Decided March 17, 2026

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA BRUCE R. NORTON,; Civil No. 1:25-CV-01216 Plaintiff,; v.: JOSEPH ADAMS, et al.,; Defendants.; Judge Jennifer P. Wilson MEMORANDUM Before the court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Martin C. Carlson recommending that the court grant Defendants’ motions to dismiss, deny Plaintiff’s second motion for preliminary injunction, and dismiss Plaintiff’s amended complaint with prejudice.

(Doc. 58.) In making these recommendations, Judge Carlson carefully analyzes whether Plaintiff’s claims fall within any of the three narrowly construed statutory exceptions to the Anti- Injunction Act. (Id. at 8–20.)

The report and recommendation concludes that the exceptions do not apply to Plaintiff’s claims and recommends granting Defendants’ motions to dismiss. (Id.) Because Plaintiff’s claims are barred by the Anti-Injunction Act, he cannot fulfill the requirements to obtain a preliminary injunction, thus, it is also recommended that the second motion for preliminary injunction be denied.

(Id. at 20–22.) Plaintiff filed objections to the report and recommendation arguing that a categorical dismissal of his claims under the Anti-Injunction Act is inappropriate, that declaratory relief remains an available remedy, that judicial immunity is inapplicable, and that leave to amend should be granted. (Doc. 59.) Defendants Matthew D. Menges and York County Court of Common Pleas opposed Plaintiff’s objections, asserting that he is rearguing his points and is simply displeased with the outcome of the report and recommendation.

(Doc. 60.) In Plaintiff’s reply brief, he argues that he has narrowed his claims to avoid the Anti-Injunction Act and that judicial immunity does not bar declaratory relief here. (Doc. 61.) When a party raises only general objections to a report and recommendation, a district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation.

Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 6–7 (3d Cir. 1984). “To obtain de novo determination of a magistrate’s findings by a district court, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) requires both timely and specific objections to the report.” Id. at 6.

Thus, when reviewing general objections to a report and recommendation, the court's review is limited "to ascertaining whether there is 'clear error' or 'manifest injustice'" on the face of the record. *Boomer v. Lewis*, No. 3:06-CV-00850, 2009 WL 2900778, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 9, 2009).

The court has reviewed Judge Carlson's report and recommendation and finds no clear error or manifest injustice on the face of the record. The objections simply disagree with the conclusions in the report and recommendation and reargue the points previously made by Plaintiff. Judge Carlson carefully analyzed the very issues now complained of by Plaintiff, and Plaintiff has not specifically objected to any aspect of Judge Carlson's analysis.

Accordingly, the court will adopt the report and recommendation, Doc. 58, overrule Plaintiff's objections, Docs. 59, grant Defendants' motions to dismiss, Docs. 33, 39, 43, deny Plaintiff's second motion for preliminary injunction, Doc. 32, dismiss Plaintiff's amended complaint with prejudice, Doc. 28, deny Plaintiff's motion to file a sur-reply as moot, Doc.

57, and close this case. An appropriate order will follow. s/Jennifer P. Wilson JENNIFER P. WILSON United States District Judge Middle District of Pennsylvania Dated: March 17, 2026