

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

Frank Tufano v. Paul Saladino, MD, et al.

Tufano · No. 4:25-CV-01960 · Decided February 3, 2026

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FRANK TUFANO, No. 4:25-CV-01960 Plaintiff, (Chief Judge Brann) v. (Magistrate Judge Latella) PAUL SALADINO, MD, et al., Defendants. ORDER FEBRUARY 3, 2026 Frank Tufano filed this civil complaint alleging that numerous individuals and entities have conspired against him.¹ In December 2025, Magistrate Judge Leo A. Latella issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court sua sponte dismiss the complaint without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.² Tufano filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation, arguing that he has stated a claim for relief and that the Court has jurisdiction over this matter.³ “If a party objects timely to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court must ‘make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.’”⁴ 1 Doc.

1. 2 Doc. 5. 3 Doc. 6. 4 Equal Emp’t Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations.⁵ After reviewing the record, the Court finds no error in Magistrate Judge Latella’s recommendation that this matter should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Consequently, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Magistrate Judge Leo A. Latella’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 5) is ADOPTED; 2. Tufano’s complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction; and 3.

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 5 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.