

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Patrick C. Matthews v. Venango County Jail

No. 1:25-cv-50 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 17, 2026) · No. 1:25-cv-50 · Decided April 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Patrick C. Matthews’s claims against the Venango County Jail. The court dismisses some claims with prejudice and others without prejudice, allowing amendment of certain municipal and ADA claims by May 15, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. Colville
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	April 17, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-50
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending screening dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). No objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For a dispositive magistrate judge recommendation, objections are reviewed de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3). In the absence of objections, the district court applies reasoned consideration to the recommendation's dispositive legal issues.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Patrick C. Matthews v. Venango County Jail

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- municipal liability
- ada / disability
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner civil rights

disability discrimination

municipal liability

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to allege facts sufficient to state a claim.
3. Whether Plaintiff's claims against Venango County Jail, the grievance-form claim, the municipal medication claim, and the ADA claim should be dismissed with or without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's dispositive Report and Recommendation, the district court must nevertheless afford reasoned consideration to the dispositive legal issues raised and may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition.
2. The complaint was properly dismissed in part with prejudice and in part without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) because it failed to allege facts sufficient to state a claim.
3. Claims against Venango County Jail and any claim based on Plaintiff receiving only one grievance form when he requested fifty were dismissed with prejudice.
4. The municipal claim concerning Plaintiff's request for medication was dismissed without prejudice, with leave to amend to allege specific facts regarding an underlying policy or custom and to name a proper municipal defendant.
5. The ADA claim was dismissed without prejudice, with leave to amend to name a proper public entity and assert specific supporting allegations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"even absent objections to the report and recommendation, a district court should 'afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,'"

"The Court agrees with the thorough and well-reasoned analysis set forth in Judge Kelly's Report and Recommendation, and the Court accepts and adopts Judge Kelly's Report and Recommendation in its entirety as the opinion of the Court with respect to Plaintiff's Complaint."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he received only one grievance form when he requested a stack of fifty and asserted claims relating to medication and disability discrimination. The court determined that the complaint failed to allege facts sufficient to state a claim, including failing to identify a proper municipal defendant and, for the medication claim, specific facts showing an underlying municipal policy or custom.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Maureen P. Kelly issued a February 10, 2026 Report and Recommendation recommending that the complaint be dismissed in part with prejudice and in part without prejudice as frivolous, malicious, and/or for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff did not object by the February 27, 2026 deadline. The district court afforded the recommendation reasoned consideration, adopted it in its entirety, dismissed specified claims, and permitted amendment of the municipal medication claim and ADA claim by May 15, 2026.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017)
- Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)

OPINION

MATTHEWS

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PATRICK C. MATTHEWS,)

)) No. 1:25-cv-50 Plaintiff,)) v.) District Judge Robert J. Colville) VENANGO COUNTY JAIL,

) Magistrate Judge Maureen P. Kelly) Defendant.))

ORDER OF COURT

Currently pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 30) filed by the Honorable Maureen P. Kelly in the above-captioned matter. Judge Kelly’s February 10, 2026 Report and Recommendation recommends that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint (ECF No. 10) with prejudice in part and without prejudice in part pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) as frivolous, malicious, and/or for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Objections to the Report and Recommendation were due by February 27, 2026. No objections were filed, and the Court considers this matter to be ripe for disposition. Objections to a magistrate judge’s disposition of a dispositive matter are subject to de novo review before the district judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The reviewing district court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation to which objections are made. *Id.* Following de novo review, “[t]he district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has explained that, “even absent objections to the report and recommendation, a district court should ‘afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,’” and has “described this level of review as ‘reasoned consideration.’” *Equal*

Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)). Upon reasoned consideration of Judge Kelly's Report and Recommendation, and following review of all relevant docket entries, it is hereby ORDERED as follows: The Court agrees with the thorough and well-reasoned analysis set forth in Judge Kelly's Report and Recommendation, and the Court accepts and adopts Judge Kelly's Report and Recommendation in its entirety as the opinion of the Court with respect to Plaintiff's Complaint. It is hereby further ORDERED as follows: 1) Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed with prejudice in part and without prejudice in part pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to allege facts sufficient to state a claim. 2) Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Venango County Jail are hereby dismissed with prejudice. 3) Any claim based upon Plaintiff receiving only one grievance form when he requested a stack of fifty is dismissed with prejudice. 4) Plaintiff's municipal claim with respect to his request for medication is dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff filing an amended complaint including specific allegations of fact regarding any alleged policy or custom underlying the same, and against a proper municipal defendant. 5) Plaintiff's ADA claim is dismissed without prejudice to Plaintiff filing an amended complaint naming a proper public entity and asserting specific allegations supporting such a claim. 6) Any amended complaint shall be filed by May 15, 2026. Failure to file an amended complaint by this deadline will result in dismissal of this matter with prejudice. BY THE COURT: /s/Robert J. Colville_____ Robert J. Colville United States District Judge DATED: April 17, 2026 cc: Patrick C. Matthews 24-2191 Venango County Prison 1186 Elk Street Franklin, PA 16323