

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Robert Pauletta v. Officer Sanguinito, et al.

Pauletta · No. 1:24-CV-01299 · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania adopted an uncontested report and recommendation recommending dismissal of Robert Pauletta’s second amended complaint. The court granted the defendants’ motions to dismiss, dismissed the complaint with prejudice, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jennifer P. Wilson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-CV-01299
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed an uncontested magistrate judge’s report and recommendation recommending that Defendants’ motions to dismiss be granted and Plaintiff’s second amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Because no objections were filed to the report and recommendation, the parties forfeited de novo review. The district court gave reasoned consideration to the uncontested portions and reviewed the record for clear error under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum; precedential status not stated

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation?
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant Defendants' motions to dismiss and dismiss the second amended complaint with prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, de novo review is forfeited; the district court may give reasoned consideration to the uncontested portions and review the record for clear error.
2. The court adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, granted Defendants' motions to dismiss, dismissed Plaintiff's second amended complaint with prejudice, and closed the case.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Robert Pauletta asserted claims against Officer Sanguinito, Andrew Parsons, and Michael Carroll in a second amended complaint. The defendants filed motions to dismiss. The opinion does not recite the underlying factual allegations or the substantive grounds for dismissal, instead adopting the magistrate judge's analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a second amended complaint against Officer Sanguinito, Andrew Parsons, and Michael Carroll. Defendants moved to dismiss. United States Magistrate Judge Sean A. Camoni recommended granting the motions and dismissing the complaint with prejudice. No party objected, so the district court reviewed the uncontested portions for clear error and independently reviewed the report and record before adopting the recommendation, granting both motions to dismiss, dismissing the complaint with prejudice, and closing the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007)
- Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)
- EEOC v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017)

OPINION

Pauletta

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROBERT PAULETTA, : Civil No. 1:24-CV-01299 Plaintiff, : v. : OFFICER SANGUINITO, et al.,
: Defendants. : Judge Jennifer P. Wilson

MEMORANDUM

Before the court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Sean A. Camoni recommending that Defendants' motions to dismiss be granted and Plaintiff's second amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice. (Doc. 42.) No party has filed objections to the report and recommendation, resulting in the forfeiture of de novo review by this court. *Nara v. Frank*, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878–79 (3d Cir. 1987)). Following an independent review of the report and record, and affording "reasoned consideration" to the uncontested portions of the report, *EEOC v. City of Long Branch*, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting *Henderson*, 812 F.2d at 879), to "satisfy [the court] that there is no clear error on the face of the record," Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes, the court finds that Judge Camoni's analysis is well-reasoned and fully supported by the record and applicable law. Accordingly, the court will adopt the report and recommendation, Doc. 42, grant the motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Officer Sanguinito and Andrew Parsons, Doc. 34, grant the motion to dismiss filed by Defendant Michael Carroll, Doc. 35, dismiss Plaintiff's second amended complaint with prejudice, Doc. 32, and close this case. An appropriate order follows.

s/Jennifer P. Wilson

JENNIFER P. WILSON

United States District Judge Middle District of Pennsylvania Dated: March 2, 2026