

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

James R. Blanchard v. Garfield Co. Court et al.

Blanchard · No. CIV-24-450-G · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma overruled Plaintiff James R. Blanchard’s objection to a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation. The court adopted the recommendation, dismissed the prisoner’s civil rights complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A based on immunity and Heck v. Humphrey, and denied subsequent motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Vaal B. Kodo
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-24-450-G
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se state prisoner objected to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of his civil-rights complaint at screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections were made, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; unpublished district court order
PARTIES	James R. Blanchard v. Garfield Co. Court et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil rights
- Prisoner civil rights
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's specific objections demonstrated error in the magistrate judge's findings that two defendants were immune.
2. Whether the plaintiff's remaining civil-rights claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey* and failed to plausibly state a claim for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3. Whether the Report and Recommendation should be adopted and the complaint dismissed without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. The plaintiff's objections did not establish error in the magistrate judge's findings that two named defendants were entitled to immunity.
2. The plaintiff's remaining claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, and the complaint failed to plausibly plead a claim for relief; dismissal on screening was therefore proper.
3. The Report and Recommendation was adopted in its entirety, the complaint was dismissed without prejudice, and the plaintiff's subsequent motions were denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Complaint (Doc. No. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

James R. Blanchard, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought a federal civil-rights action against Garfield County Court and other defendants. His claims arose from alleged errors by state courts in his prior efforts to obtain relief. On screening, the magistrate judge determined that two defendants were immune and that the remaining claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey* because they failed to plausibly state a claim for relief in the federal action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated the federal civil-rights action on May 3, 2024. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Suzanne Mitchell, who recommended dismissal on November 21, 2024, concluding that two defendants were immune and that the remaining claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*. The district court reviewed the specific objections de novo, overruled them, adopted the Report and Recommendation in its entirety, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, and denied subsequent motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994)
- *United States v. 2121 E. 30th St.*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

Blanchard

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

JAMES R. BLANCHARD,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. CIV-24-450-G) GARFIELD CO. COURT et al.,)) Defendants.)

ORDER

Plaintiff James R. Blanchard, a state prisoner appearing pro se, initiated this federal civil rights action on May 3, 2024. See Compl. (Doc. No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Suzanne Mitchell for preliminary review. On November 21, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 28) recommending that Plaintiff's claims be dismissed on screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Specifically, Judge Mitchell found that two of the named defendants are entitled to immunity and that Plaintiff's remaining claims are barred pursuant to *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477

(1994). See R. & R. at 6-11.

Plaintiff has filed an Objection to the R. & R. See Doc. No. 31. Pursuant to controlling authority, the Court reviews de novo the portions of the R. & R. to which specific objections have been made. See *United States v. 2121 E. 30th St.*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Plaintiff's Objection largely reurges the merit of his legal claims and points to alleged errors by the state courts in his prior attempts to obtain relief. See Pl.'s Obj. at 1-

2. Nothing therein evinces any error in Judge Mitchell's specific findings regarding either immunity or *Heck* or in the R. & R.'s conclusion that Plaintiff fails to plausibly plead a claim for relief in the instant action. See R. & R. at 6-11; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). Accordingly, Plaintiff's Objection is overruled.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 28) is ADOPTED in its entirety. The Complaint (Doc. No. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice. Plaintiff's subsequent Motions (Doc. No. 34) are DENIED as moot in light of this determination. A separate judgment shall be entered. IT IS SO ORDERED this 10th day of March, 2026. (Vaal B. Kodo United States District Judge