

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

WO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Walter C Goedecke,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
Unknown Mooney, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. CV-16-03432-PHX-JAT (ESW)

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge recommending that Defendant Thomas be dismissed, without prejudice, due to Plaintiff’s failure to timely serve Defendant Thomas. (Doc. 26).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, the Court hereby accepts the R&R. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection” (emphasis added)); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (“statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003).

Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 26) is accepted and adopted.

