WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Cornelius Isaac Hunter,

Plaintiff,

v.

US Corrections Transport, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-18-00899-PHX-JAT (JFM)

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (R&R) from the Magistrate Judge recommending the Defendant Simmons be dismissed for failure to timely serve. (Doc. 37). Neither party has file objections to the R&R.

This 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, 1226 (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.'"); *Klamath Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. U.S. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 589 F.3d 1027, 1032 (9th Cir. 2009) (the district court "must review de novo the portions of the [Magistrate Judge's] recommendations to which the parties object."). District courts are not required to conduct "any review at all . . . *of any issue* that is not the subject of an

objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (emphasis added); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.").

Because neither party objected,

IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 37) is accepted; Defendant Simmons is dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to timely serve. Because another Defendant remains in this case, the Clerk of the Court shall not enter judgment at this time.

Dated this 14th day of February, 2019.

