

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Forrest Juan Craddock,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Sheriff Chris Vasquez,
Defendant.

No. cv-07-00406-PHX-ROS

ORDER

On July 15th, 2008, Magistrate Judge Mark E. Aspey issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff’s Motions at Docket No. 60, No. 81, and No.88 be denied. Plaintiff failed to file timely objections.

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). It is “clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations *de novo if objection is made*, but not otherwise.” United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (emphasis in original); Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1126 (D. Ariz. 2003) (“Following Reyna-Tapia, this Court concludes that *de novo* review of factual and legal issues is required if objections are made, ‘but not otherwise.’”). District courts are not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject


1 of an objection.” Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). No objection having been
2 made, the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS ORDERED** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 109) is **ADOPTED**.
5 Plaintiff’s Motions are **DISMISSED**.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED this 23rd day of September, 2008.



Roslyn O. Silver
United States District Judge