

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

FRANK TUFANO,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAUL SALADINO, MD, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:25-CV-01960

(Chief Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Latella)

**ORDER**

**FEBRUARY 3, 2026**

Frank Tufano filed this civil complaint alleging that numerous individuals and entities have conspired against him.<sup>1</sup> In December 2025, Magistrate Judge Leo A. Latella issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court *sua sponte* dismiss the complaint without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup> Tufano filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation, arguing that he has stated a claim for relief and that the Court has jurisdiction over this matter.<sup>3</sup>

“If a party objects timely to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court must ‘make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.’”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Doc. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Equal Emp’t Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Long Branch*, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)).

Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations.<sup>5</sup> After reviewing the record, the Court finds no error in Magistrate Judge Latella’s recommendation that this matter should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Consequently, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge Leo A. Latella’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 5) is **ADOPTED**;
2. Tufano’s complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction; and
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Matthew W. Brann*

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>5</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.