

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

Anthony E. Proctor v. Susquehanna Township Borough, et al.

Proctor · No. 1:24-CV-02008 · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania reviewed general objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning Anthony E. Proctor’s amended civil rights complaint. Finding no clear error or manifest injustice, the court adopted the report and recommendation and dismissed the amended complaint without leave to amend, including recommendations concerning the false-arrest, retaliation, and access-to-the-courts claims.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA ANTHONY E. PROCTOR,; Civil No. 1:24-CV-02008 Plaintiff,; v.: SUSQUEHANNA TOWNSHIP: BOROUGH, et al.,; Defendants.: Judge Jennifer P. Wilson
MEMORANDUM Before the court is the report and recommendation of retired United States Magistrate Judge William Arbuckle recommending that Plaintiff’s amended complaint, Doc.

11, be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to state a claim without leave to amend. (Doc. 12.) Judge Arbuckle further recommends that: (1) Plaintiff’s claim for false arrest against the police officers and relevant municipality should be dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff’s ability to pursue that claim after his criminal case is resolved; and (2) Plaintiff’s claim for retaliation and access to the courts against Dauphin County Prison employees should be dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff’s ability to pursue those claims in a separate action.

(Id.) Plaintiff filed an “objection to report and recommendation and an amended complaint,” which is difficult to read. (Doc. 13.) However, the court has carefully reviewed this document and will liberally construe it as general objection to the report and recommendation. When a party raises only general objections to a report and recommendation, a district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation.

Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 6–7 (3d Cir. 1984). “To obtain de novo determination of a magistrate’s findings by a district court, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) requires both timely and specific objections to the report.” Id. at 6.

Thus, when reviewing general objections to a report and recommendation, the court’s review is limited “to ascertaining whether there is ‘clear error’ or ‘manifest injustice’” on the face of the

record. *Boomer v. Lewis*, No. 3:06-CV-00850, 2009 WL 2900778, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 9, 2009).

The court has reviewed Judge Arbuckle's report and recommendation and finds no clear error or manifest injustice on the face of the record. The objection, to the extent the court can read the handwriting, merely expresses disagreement with Judge Arbuckle's analysis and reasserts the allegations contained in the complaint.

Accordingly, the court will adopt the report and recommendation, Doc. 12, and dismiss the amended complaint, Doc. 11, without leave to amend. An appropriate order will follow. s/Jennifer P. Wilson JENNIFER P. WILSON United States District Judge Middle District of Pennsylvania
Dated: February 17, 2026