

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**

Victor A. Parsons,)	No. CV-11-00075-PHX-NVW (MEA)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER
)	
v.)	
)	
Charles L. Ryan, Ronolfo Macabuhay,)	
Terry Allred, Bruce McMarron, IHS Dr.)	
Roe, Dr. Adu-Tutu;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Aspey (Doc. 28) regarding Plaintiff’s ’s Motion to Amend Complaint (Doc. 21). The R&R recommends that the motion for leave to file an amended complaint be denied. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R. (R&R at 15). Plaintiff filed his objection on August 3, 2011, styled as an “Objection to Report and Recommendation/Motion for Reconsideration.” (Docs. 30, 31.)

The Court has considered the objections and reviewed the Report and Recommendation de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (stating that the court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made). The Court agrees with the


1 Magistrate Judge's determinations, accepts the recommended decision within the meaning
2 of Rule 72(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., and overrules Plaintiff's objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. §
3 636(b)(1) (stating that the district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in
4 part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate").

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the
6 Magistrate Judge (Doc. 28) is accepted.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint (Doc.
8 21) is denied.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 31)
10 is denied.

11 DATED this 5th day of August, 2011.

12
13 
14 _____
Neil V. Wake
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28