

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

William R. Gibson v. Bobbi Salamon, Superintendent, SCI-Rockview,
et al.

Gibson · No. 3:25-cv-73 · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and denied William R. Gibson’s habeas corpus petition as moot. The petition challenged a 2024 denial of parole, but Gibson was subsequently denied parole again in 2025, superseding the challenged denial. The court also concluded that amendment would be futile and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephanie L. Haines
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-73
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 from denials of parole. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended dismissal as moot. After no objections were filed, the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and denied the Petition as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely and specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court applies a reasoned-consideration standard under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 72.D.2.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court memorandum order; persuasive value only.
PARTIES	William R. Gibson v. Bobbi Salamon, Superintendent, SCI-Rockview, et al.

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

civil procedure

mootness

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Gibson's habeas petition challenging the 2024 denial of parole became moot after a later parole application was denied in 2025.
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when Gibson filed no timely objections.
3. Whether amendment of the habeas petition would be futile.

HOLDINGS

1. The Petition was moot because the 2024 parole denial was superseded by the later 2025 parole denial, leaving no meaningful relief that the court could grant concerning the challenged denial.
2. The court adopted the Report and Recommendation in whole after reviewing it under the applicable reasoned-consideration standard because Gibson filed no timely and specific objections.
3. Any amendment would be futile because the parole denial challenged in the Petition was no longer the basis for Gibson's continued detention.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“where it is plainly apparent from the face of the petition that the petitioner will not prevail, the petition should be dismissed without ordering the respondent to answer.”

“Thus, if developments occur during the litigation that eliminate a petitioner’s personal stake in the outcome of a suit or prevent a court from granting effective relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gibson, incarcerated at SCI-Rockview, challenged the denial of parole, attaching parole-denial letters dated September 28, 2023, and October 22, 2024. He later filed a brief after parole was denied again on October 16, 2025. Because he could and did reapply for parole, the 2024 denial was superseded by the 2025 denial and was no longer the basis for his custody.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Gibson filed a pro se § 2254 petition challenging parole denials in 2023 and 2024. The case was initially administratively closed because Gibson neither paid the filing fee nor sought in forma pauperis status, and he later filed a brief after a further parole denial in October 2025. Magistrate Judge Keith A. Pesto recommended dismissal, concluding that the petition was moot, unexhausted, meritless, and inadequately prosecuted. Gibson filed no objections, and the district court adopted the recommendation and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Santiago Rosario v. Philadelphia County, No. CV 19-6017, 2020 WL 8674051, at *1-2 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 24, 2020), report and recommendation adopted sub nom. Rosario v. Philadelphia County, No. 19-CV-6017, 2021 WL 765781 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 26, 2021)
- Pritchard v. Wetzell, No. 13-5406, 2014 WL 199907, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2014)
- Smallwood v. Meisel, No. 13-3989, 2013 WL 6153238, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 16, 2013), report and recommendation adopted, 2013 WL 6145123 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 21, 2013)
- Ogunlana v. Barraza, No. 4:22-CV-01854, 2022 WL 17814213, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Dec. 14, 2022)
- Shaw v. Wynder, No. Civ.A. 08-1863, 2008 WL 3887642 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 21, 2008)
- Craig v. Rozum, No. Civ.A. 07-5490, 2008 WL 920346 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 2, 2008)
- Watson v. Wynder, No. 07-4066 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 27, 2007)
- PorteYanes v. Lore, No. CIV 4:CV-07-1525, 2007 WL 2852385 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 27, 2007)
- Allen v. Perini, 424 F.2d 134, 140-41 (6th Cir. 1970)
- Alexander v. Corbin, No. CIV.A. 11-2727, 2011 WL 5340568, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 28, 2011), report and recommendation adopted, 2011 WL 5357828 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 3, 2011)
- Tice v. Wilson, No. 1:24-CV-46-RAL, 2024 WL 1771054, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 29, 2024), report and recommendation rejected on other grounds, 2024 WL 1550331 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 10, 2024)
- EEOC v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017)
- Grayson v. Mayview State Hospital, 293 F.3d 103 (3d Cir. 2002)
- Burkey v. Marberry, 556 F.3d 142, 147-48 (3d Cir. 2009)
- Keitel v. Mazurkiewicz, 729 F.3d 278, 280 (3d Cir. 2013)