

**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

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