| 1 | WO | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | Joshua David Mellberg LLC, et al., | No. CV-14-02025-TUC-CKJ (LCK) |
| 10 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER |
| 11 | v. | |
| 12 | Jovan Will, et al., | |
| 13 | Defendants. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | On June 21, 2019, Magistrate Judge Lynnette C. Kimmins issued a Report and | |
| 16 | Recommendation (Doc. 480) in which she recommended the Court enter an Order granting | |
| 17 | Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Answer of Defendant Arceo and Enter Default (Doc. 449). The | |
| 18 | Report and Recommendation advised the parties that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37 | |
| 19 | provides for five factors for the Court to consider before sanctioning a party for failing to | |
| 20 | comply with a discovery order. Judge Kimmins determined that four of the five factors | |
| 21 | favored striking Defendant Arceo's Answer and entering his default. | |
| 22 | The Report and Recommendation also advised the parties that, pursuant to Federal | |
| 23 | Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2), any party may serve and file written objections within | |
| 24 | fourteen (14) days of being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation. No | |
| 25 | objections have been filed within the time provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). ¹ | |
| 26 | $\frac{1}{1}$ The standard of review that is applied to a magi | strate judge's report and recommendation |
| 27 | is dependent upon whether a party files an objection – the Court need not review portions of a report to which a party does not object. <i>Thomas v. Arn</i> , 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). However, the Court must "determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

| 1 | After an independent review, the Courts finds it appropriate to adopt the Report and | |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | Recommendation and grant Plaintiffs' Motion (Doc. 449). | |
| 3 | Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED: | |
| 4 | 1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 480) is adopted . | |
| 5 | 2. Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Answer of Defendant Arceo and Enter Default | |
| 6 | (Doc. 449) is granted. | |
| 7 | 3. The Clerk of the Court shall strike Defendant John Steve Arceo's Answer | |
| 8 | (Doc. 81) and enter his default. | |
| 9 | Dated this 15th day of July, 2019. | |
| 10 | <u> </u> | |
| 11 | United States District Judge | |
| 12 13 | | |
| 13 14 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | judge with instructions." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). | |
| 28 | Nonetheless, "while the statute does not require the judge to review an issue de novo if n objections are filed, it does not preclude further review by the district judge, sua sponte of at the request of a party, under a de novo or any other standard." <i>Thomas</i> , 474 U.S. at 154 | |
| | - 2 - | |
| | | |
| | | |