

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Donna M. Bulris v. Nancy Bulris-Rowell; Hillary Clinton; Men and
Women Ignorant Society; and President Obama

Bulris · No. 1:25-CV-0549 (GTS/PJE) · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of New York adopted a magistrate judge’s Report-Recommendation and dismissed Donna M. Bulris’s pro se civil rights complaint without prejudice and without leave to amend. The court denied her requests for counsel and other relief and cautioned that continued meritless litigation could result in restrictions on future pro se filings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Glenn T. Suddaby
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-0549 (GTS/PJE)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation recommending sua sponte dismissal of a pro se civil rights complaint without prejudice and without leave to amend. The plaintiff filed an untimely objection, which the court accepted out of special solicitude, and also filed a letter-motion requesting various relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Specific objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation receive de novo review; conclusory or general objections, and portions to which no specific objection is made, receive clear-error review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil rights
- section 1983
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's untimely objection to the magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation should be accepted and what standard of review should apply.
2. Whether the Report-Recommendation recommending sua sponte dismissal without prejudice and without leave to amend should be adopted.
3. Whether the plaintiff's additional requests for appointment of counsel, arrest and sanctions against a defendant, and other relief should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court accepted the plaintiff's untimely objection out of special solicitude, found no error in the specifically objected-to portions and no clear error in the remaining portions, and adopted the Report-Recommendation in its entirety.
2. The plaintiff's complaint was dismissed without prejudice and without leave to amend for the reasons stated in the adopted Report-Recommendation, including lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) and/or failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii).
3. The plaintiff's requests for appointment of counsel, arrest and sanctions against Nancy Bulris-Rowell, and other relief in the letter-motion were denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons stated therein."

"Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice and without prior leave to amend"

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Donna M. Bulris brought a pro se civil rights action against Nancy Bulris-Rowell, Hillary Clinton, Men and Women Ignorant Society, and President Obama. The magistrate judge recommended sua sponte dismissal based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction and/or failure to state a claim. The district court found that the magistrate judge applied the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se civil rights action in the Northern District of New York. Magistrate Judge Paul J. Evangelista recommended sua sponte dismissal without prejudice and without leave to amend for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) and/or failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). The district court accepted the untimely objection, reviewed the challenged portions for

clear error or de novo review as applicable, found no error, adopted the Report-Recommendation in its entirety, dismissed the complaint, and denied the plaintiff's additional requests for relief.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Caldwell v. Crosset, 09-CV-0576, 2010 WL 2346330, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. June 9, 2010)
- Farid v. Bouey, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 307 (N.D.N.Y. 2008)
- Batista v. Walker, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DONNA M. BULRIS, Plaintiff, 1:25-CV-0549 v. (GTS/PJE) NANCY BULRIS-ROWELL; HILLARY CLINTON; MEN AND WOMEN IGNORANT SOCIETY; and PRESIDENT OBAMA, Defendants.

APPEARANCES: DONNA M. BULRIS, 35904 Plaintiff, Pro Se CNY PC Building 39, Ward 501 P.O.

Box 300 Marcy, New York 13403 GLENN T. SUDDABY, United States District Judge
DECISION and ORDER Currently before the Court, in this pro se civil rights action filed by Donna M. Bulris (“Plaintiff”) against Nancy Bulris-Rowell, Hillary Clinton, Men and Women Ignorant Society, and President Obama (“Defendants”), is United States Magistrate Judge Paul J. Evangelista’s Report-Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff’s Complaint be sua sponte dismissed without prejudice and without leave to amend for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Fed.

R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3), and/or for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). (Dkt. No. 22.) Plaintiff has filed an untimely Objection, which (out of special solicitude to Plaintiff) the Court has accepted. (Dkt. No. 24.) She has also filed a letter-motion requesting various relief. (Dkt. No. 23.)

After carefully reviewing the relevant papers herein, including Magistrate Judge Evangelista’s thorough Report-Recommendation, the Court can find no error in any portion of the Report-Recommendation to which Plaintiff has specifically objected,¹ and no clear error in the remaining portions of the Report-Recommendation:² Magistrate Judge Evangelista employed the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts.

As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons stated therein. In addition, Plaintiff’s letter-motion requesting various relief is denied as moot,

procedurally improper and/or without merit for the reasons stated in Magistrate Judge Evangelista's Text Order of January 5, 2026. (Dkt. No. 25.)

Finally, Plaintiff is respectfully cautioned that she is fast becoming a vexatious litigant. (See Dkt. No. 22, at 6-7 [listing Plaintiff's three other actions in this District].) Should she continue her practice of meritless litigation in this District, she may be directed to show cause 1 Parties may raise objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, but they must be "specific written objections."

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); accord, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c). "A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Report and Recommendation]... to which [specific] objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c); accord, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). "Where, however, an objecting party makes only conclusory or general objections, the Court reviews the Report and Recommendation only for clear error."

Caldwell v. Crosset, 09-CV-0576, 2010 WL 2346330, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. June 9, 2010) (quoting Farid v. Bouey, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 307 (N.D.N.Y. 2008)) (internal quotation marks omitted). 2 When no objection is made to a report-recommendation, the Court subjects that report-recommendation to only a clear error review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes: 1983 Addition.

When performing such a "clear error" review, "the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Id.; see also Batista v. Walker, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995) (Sotomayor, J.) ("I am permitted to adopt those sections of [a magistrate judge's] report to which no specific objection is made, so long as those sections are not facially erroneous.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

2 why she should not be enjoined from filing and litigating future actions pro se without prior leave of the District's Chief Judge. ACCORDINGLY, it is ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Evangelista's Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 22) is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in its entirety; and it is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice and without prior leave to amend; and it is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's requests for appointment of counsel (Dkt.

Nos. 5, 6, 12, 16) are DENIED; and it is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's request that this Court arrest and sanction Nancy Bulris-Rowell (Dkt. No. 16) is DENIED; and it is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's letter-motion requesting various relief (Dkt. No. 23) is DENIED. Dated: January 26, 2026 Syracuse, New York Glenn T. Suddaby; U.S. District Judge