

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Michael J. Robinson v. City of Shamokin, et al.

Michael J. Robinson v. City of Shamokin, No. 4:25cv1134 (M.D. Pa. Nov. 25, 2025) · No. No. 4:25cv1134 ·
Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania overruled Michael J. Robinson’s objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. The court adopted the recommendation, dismissed Robinson’s second amended complaint with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), dismissed related motions as moot, and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	United States District Judge Malachy E. Mannion
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	No. 4:25cv1134
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending dismissal with prejudice of Robinson's second amended complaint for failure to state a claim, together with dismissal of related motions as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court must conduct a de novo determination of portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objections are made. General objections do not require a complete de novo review of the underlying issues.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Michael J. Robinson v. City of Shamokin, et al.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- section 1983
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

municipal law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Robinson's general objections required the district court to conduct a complete de novo review of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.
2. Whether Robinson's second amended complaint stated any claim upon which relief could be granted.
3. Whether further leave to amend should be granted.
4. Whether motions associated with the second amended complaint remained viable after dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. General objections that merely express disagreement with a report and recommendation and do not address the magistrate judge's analysis do not require the district court to conduct a complete de novo determination of the underlying issues.
2. The second amended complaint failed to state any claim upon which relief could be granted and was properly dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).
3. Further leave to amend was denied because amendment would be futile.
4. The motions associated with the second amended complaint were dismissed as moot following dismissal of the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“remarkably obscure...sentence fragments which set forth various random allegations in a scatter-shot fashion.” (Doc. 75 at 2)

“Providing a complete de novo determination where only a general objection to ar R&R is offered, however, “would undermine the efficiency the magistrate system was meant to contribute to the judicial process.”” (749 F.2d at 7)

“a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” (551 U.S. at 94)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Robinson alleged that shortcomings in municipal elections resulted from a broad government conspiracy involving local officials and other individuals. His pleadings were characterized as sprawling, cryptic, obscure, and composed of sentence fragments and disconnected allegations. Despite two opportunities to amend, Robinson did not identify the alleged conspirators, specify their conduct, or explain how the alleged events formed a legally cognizable claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Robinson's original complaint was dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), with leave to amend. His first amended complaint was also dismissed, again with an opportunity to amend. After Robinson filed a second amended complaint and several related motions, Magistrate Judge Carlson recommended dismissal with prejudice. Robinson filed general objections, which the district court overruled, adopted the R&R in full, dismissed the second amended complaint with prejudice, dismissed the ancillary motions as moot, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 877 (3d Cir. 1987)
- Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 7 (3d Cir. 1984)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)