

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Dominique Castile v. Niagara County; Sheriff Michael J. Filicetti, in his Official and Individual Capacity as Sheriff of Niagara County; Primecare Medical of New York, Inc.; Primecare Medical, Inc.; Leanne Giaccotto, R.N.; Lindsay Getz, R.N.; Rene Marriott, R.N.; Umbrine Fatima, M.D.; and John Doe 1 through 5

Castile · No. 25-CV-655 (JLS) (JJM) · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of New York adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning removal, remand, and dismissal of claims arising from medical treatment at the Niagara County Jail. The court denied the plaintiff’s motion to remand and denied the defendants’ motion to dismiss without prejudice to renewal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John L. Sinatra, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-655 (JLS) (JJM)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After removal from New York state court, Plaintiff moved to remand and Defendants moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim. The magistrate judge recommended denying both motions, with denial of the motion to dismiss without prejudice to renewal. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When objections are filed to a magistrate judge's recommendation, the district court must conduct de novo review of the objected-to portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(8). When no objections are filed, neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Rule 72 requires the district court to review the recommendation.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court decision; precedential status not stated.
PARTIES	Dominique Castile v. Niagara County, Sheriff Michael J. Filicetti, Primecare Medical of New York, Inc., Primecare Medical, Inc., Leanne Giaccotto, R.N., Lindsay Getz, R.N., Rene Marriott, R.N., Umbrine Fatima, M.D., John Doe 1 through 5

TOPICS

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

subject matter jurisdiction

section 1983

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

health law

disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should remand the removed action to New York state court.
2. Whether the district court should dismiss Plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim.
3. What level of review applies to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when neither party files objections.

HOLDINGS

1. When neither party objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 do not require the district court to review the recommendation.
2. The motion to remand is denied.
3. The motion to dismiss is denied without prejudice to renewal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised.”

“Thus, for the reasons in the R&R, Plaintiffs motion to remand, Dkt. 5, is DENIED, and Defendants’ motions to dismiss, Dkt. 8, is DENIED without prejudice to renewal.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dominique Castile alleges claims under New York law, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the Americans with Disabilities Act arising from medical treatment he received at the Niagara County Jail. He initially filed the action in New York state court, after which Defendants removed it to the Western District of New York. The opinion addresses only the procedural motions to remand and dismiss and does not resolve the merits of the underlying medical-treatment claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the action in New York state court on May 29, 2025, asserting New York-law, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and Americans with Disabilities Act claims arising from medical treatment at the Niagara County Jail. Defendants removed the action on July 21, 2025. Plaintiff moved to remand, and Defendants moved to dismiss. Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy recommended denying the remand motion and denying the dismissal motion without prejudice to renewal. No objections were filed, and the district court accepted and adopted the recommendation.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case is referred back to Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy consistent with the August 22, 2025 referral order. The motion to dismiss may be renewed.

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985)

OPINION

STATES DISTR, FILED x > UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT = mee 30 909 □ WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Mee eM 2026 TO So W. woeuss. w DOMINIQUE CASTILE, iste Plaintiff, Vv. 25-CV-655 (JLS) (JJM) NIAGARA COUNTY; SHERIFF MICHAEL J. FILICETTI, in his Official and Individual Capacity as Sheriff of Niagara County; PRIMECARE MEDICAL OF NEW YORK, INC.; PRIMECARE MEDICAL, INC.; LEANNE GIACCOTTO, R.N.; LINDSAY GETZ, R.N.; RENE MARRIOTT, R.N.; UMBRINE FATIMA, M.D.; and JOHN DOE 1 through 5 (said Niagara County supervisor(s) and/or Niagara County Sheriff Department supervisor(s) or employee(s) or staff on Duty involved in the incident and underlying claims), Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER Plaintiff Dominique Castile commenced this action in New York state court on May 29, 2025, asserting claims under New York state law, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, based on the circumstances surrounding his medical treatment at the Niagara County Jail. Dkt. 1-2.

The case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy for all proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A), (B), and (C). Dkt. 6. On July 21, 2025, Defendants removed the action to the Western District of New York. Dkt. 1.

On August 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to remand the action to state court. Dkt. 5. Defendants opposed this motion, Dkt. 12, and Plaintiff replied. Dkt. 14. On August 29, 2025, Defendants also

moved to dismiss Plaintiffs complaint for failure to state a claim. Dkt. 8.

On March 4, 2026, Judge McCarthy issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R) addressing Plaintiffs motion to remand, Dkt. 5, and Defendants' motion to dismiss, Dkt. 8. See Dkt. 17. He recommends that this Court deny Plaintiffs motion to remand, Dkt. 5, and deny Defendants' motion to dismiss without prejudice to renewal, Dkt. 8. Id. at 5. Neither party filed objections, and the time to do so has expired.

See *id.* A district court may accept, reject, or modify the findings or recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(8). A district court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation to which a party objects. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(8). But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised.

See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985). This Court carefully reviewed the R&R and, based on that review, and in the absence of any objections, the Court accepts and adopts Judge McCarthy's recommendation. Thus, for the reasons in the R&R, Plaintiffs motion to remand, Dkt. 5, is DENIED, and Defendants' motions to dismiss, Dkt. 8, is DENIED without prejudice to renewal.

The case is referred back to Judge McCarthy consistent with the August 22, 2025 referral order. See Dkt. 6. SO ORDERED. Dated: March 30, 2026 □ Buffalo, New York / | ig JOHN L. SINATRA, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE