

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

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

Tufano · No. 3:25-CV-1400 · Decided March 20, 2026

OPINION

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FILED SCRANTON FRANK TUFANO, MAR 20 2026 Plaintiff pen V.: 3:25-CV-1400 DEPUTY CLERK: (JUDGE MARIANI) PAUL SALADINO, MD, et al., Defendants: ORDER AND NOW, THIS 3 OF MARCH, 2026, upon review of Magistrate Judge Leo Latella's Report & Recommendation ("R&R") (Doc. 6) for clear error or manifest injustice,' IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT: 1.

The R&R (Doc. 6) is ADOPTED for the reasons stated therein. 2. Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. ' Ifa party timely and properly files a written objection to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the District Court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also, *Brown v. Astrue*, 649 F.3d 193, 195 (3d Cir.

2011); M.D. Pa. Local Rule 72.3. Here, following the issuance of the R&R, Plaintiff filed a "Response to Report and Recommendations by Judge Latella" (Doc. 8, at 1) and "Brief in Support of Motion for Leave to File Third Party Complaint" (Doc. 7; Doc. 8 at 2). Plaintiff's filings are insufficient to rise to the level of one or more Objections fo the R&R. Tufano's one- page, near- identical, filings reference the R&R's "comprehensive and detailed reasoning for why {his} claims are not admissible" but assert that "clear wrongdoing" has nonetheless been committed against him and that he would "prefer this matter to be determined by a trial of his peers as opposed to any individual judge." (See Doc.

8, at 1; see also, Doc. 7). Plaintiff's filings do not reference any specific portions of the R&R to which objection is made or set forth any statement or assertion which would alter the correctness of the pending R&R or affect this Court's review of the R&R.

The Court thus need not engage in a de novo analysis, Nonetheless, upon review of the relevant documents, even if this Court applied a de novo review, the result would be the same. 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE the above-captioned action. Robert D. Mariani United States District Judge

