2

Į

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

7

8

9

10

11

5

'|| | LAURIE J. EMIGH,

Plaintiff,

VS.

UCSF MEDICAL CENTER,

Defendant.

Case No: C 12-06533 SBA

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Docket 5

12 13

17 18

19

2021

22 23

2425

26

2728

On March 6, 2013, magistrate judge Elizabeth Laporte ("the magistrate") issued a Report and Recommendation in which she recommends that this action be dismissed based on Plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee or file an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Dkt. 5. The Report and Recommendation states that "[b]ecause all parties have not consented to this Court's jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the Court issues this Report and Recommendation and hereby reassigns the case to a district judge." <u>Id.</u> On March 7, 2013, this case was reassigned to the undersigned. Dkt. 6.

Any objections to the magistrate's Report and Recommendation were required to be filed within fourteen days of service thereof. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(2); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made," and "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)(C).

The deadline to file an objection to the Report and Recommendation was March 20, 2013. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(a)(1); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(2); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). To date, no objections have been filed. In the absence of a timely objection, the Court "need only

satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Fed.R.Civ.P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (citing <u>Campbell v. U.S. Dist. Court</u>, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also <u>United States v. Reyna-Tapia</u>, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) ("The statute [28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)] makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if [an] objection is made*, but not otherwise.") (en banc). The Court has reviewed the record on its face and finds no clear error. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the magistrate's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5) is ACCEPTED and shall become the Order of this Court. This Order terminates Docket 5. The Clerk shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/25/13

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMS RONG United States District Judge

1	INITED CTATES DISTRICT COLUDT
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	I AUDIE LEMICH
5	LAURIE J EMIGH,
6	Plaintiff,
7	V.
8	UCSF MEDICAL CENTER et al,
9	Defendant.
10	
11	Case Number: CV12-06533 SBA
12	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
13	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
14	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
15	
16	That on March 25, 2013, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
17	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
18	
19	
20	Laurie J Emigh
21	572 - 37 th Avenue
22	San Francisco, CA 94121
23	Dated: March 25, 2013 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
24	
25	By: Lisa Clark, Deputy Clerk
26	
27	
28	

- 3 -