



defendant Boquist. The time for filing objections to the report has run. No objections have been filed.

## **II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The district court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.”<sup>1</sup> When reviewing a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court conducts *de novo* review of all conclusions of law,<sup>2</sup> and any findings of fact to which objections have been made.<sup>3</sup> Uncontested findings of fact are reviewed for clear error.<sup>4</sup>

## **III. DISCUSSION**

Having reviewed the file and applied the standard of review articulated above, this court concludes that the magistrate judge has correctly found the facts and applied the law. Judge Smith’s report is exceedingly thorough and very well reasoned. Defendant Boquist’s contacts with Alaska clearly support the exercise of specific jurisdiction in this case. This court adopts Magistrate Judge Smith’s recommended findings and conclusions in her report at docket 69. Based thereon, the motion at docket 12 is **DENIED** with respect to specific jurisdiction. The court will adjudicate plaintiffs’ claims.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
JOHN W. SEDWICK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup>28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup>*Barilla v. Ervin*, 886 F.2d 1514, 1518 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989), *overruled on other grounds by Simpson v. Lear Astronics Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1170, 1174 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996).

<sup>3</sup>28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>4</sup>*Taberer v. Armstrong World Industries, Inc.*, 954 F.2d 888, 906 (3d Cir. 1992).