

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**RS, a minor, represented by and through  
his parents and guardians, SS and TS,**

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 3:11-cv-0667-ST  
OPINION AND ORDER

**DETECTIVE RICH MATRISCIANO, an  
individual; JANE DOE, an individual;  
CITY OF HILLSBORO, a municipal  
corporation; BRENDA VOYTEK, an  
individual; and OREGON DEPARTMENT  
OF HUMAN SERVICES, a public body,**

Defendants.

Thomas Freedman, Jr.  
Pearl Law LLC  
312 N.W. 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 201  
Portland, Oregon 97209  
Attorney for Plaintiff

Steven A. Kraemer  
Leslie Anne Edenhofer  
Hoffman Hart & Wagner, LLP  
1000 S.W. Broadway, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
Attorneys for Defendants Rich Matrisciano and  
City of Hillsboro

Opinion and Order, Page

Dirk L. Pierson  
Department of Justice  
Trial Division, Torts Section  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, Oregon 97301  
Attorney for Defendants Oregon Department of Human  
Services and Brenda Voytek

**SIMON, District Judge:**

On October 25, 2011, Magistrate Judge Janice Stewart filed Findings and Recommendations in this case (doc. # 32). Judge Stewart recommended that the motion to dismiss filed by defendant Brenda Voytek (doc. # 20) be denied. No objections have been filed.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may “accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Stewart’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Stewart’s Findings and Recommendation (doc. # 32).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of December, 2011.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge