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

AARON HOPE, *et al.*, : Civil No. 1:20-CV-00562

:

Petitioners,

v. : Judge Jennifer P. Wilson

:

CLAIR DOLL, et al.,

.

Respondents. : Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson

ORDER

Before the court is the report and recommendation of United States

Magistrate Judge Martin Carlson recommending that the petition for writ of habeas
corpus be dismissed as moot. (Doc. 54.) Petitioners timely filed objections to the
report and recommendation. (Doc. 84.) Respondents filed a brief in opposition to
Defendant's objections. (Doc. Doc. 87.) Petitioners then filed a reply brief. (Doc.
91.) The objections and report and recommendation are ripe for review.

Petitioners' objections merely restate and reargue the issues that Judge

Carlson already considered and rejected in the report and recommendation. Since

mere disagreement with the report and recommendation is not a basis to decline to
adopt the report and recommendation, the court construes Petitioners' objections as
general objections.

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 Carlson's report and recommendation and finds no clear error or manifest injustice on the face of the record. Indeed, Judge Carlson's analysis thoroughly considers and addresses the arguments raised by Petitioners in their objections. The fact that Petitioners disagree with the outcome of this analysis is not a basis to decline to adopt the report and recommendation.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- The report and recommendation issued by United States Magistrate
 Judge Carlson, Doc. 54, is ADOPTED in its entirety.
- 2. Petitioners' general objections, Doc. 84, are **OVERRULED**.
- 3. Petitioners' petition for writ of habeas corpus, Doc. 1, is **DENIED**.
- 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

s/Jennifer P. Wilson
JENNIFER P. WILSON
United States District Court Judge
Middle District of Pennsylvania

Dated: July 25, 2022