UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 OAKLAND DIVISION RAUL BONILLAS, an individual, Case No: C 12-6574 SBA Plaintiff, ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF 7 FENDANT'S MOTION FOR DE VS. OVO DETERMINATION OF UNITED AIR LINES, INC., and DOES 1 SPOSITIVE MATTER through 10, inclusive, REFERRED TO MAGISTRATE 9 JUDGE Defendants. 10 Dkt. 193 11 On August 19, 2014, the Court granted Defendant's motion for summary judgment **12** and entered judgment accordingly. Dkt. 145, 146. Defendant then filed a motion for 13 attorney's fees, which the Court referred to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte ("the 14 Magistrate") for a report and recommendation, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and 15 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Dkt. 149, 151. On February 18, 2015, the Magistrate issued her 16 report and recommendation, recommending that the Court deny Defendant's motion. Dkt. **17** 191. 18 On March 4, 2015, Defendant timely filed a Motion for De Novo Determination of 19 Dispositive Matter Referred to Magistrate Judge, which is noticed for hearing on April 14, 20 2015. Dkt. 193. Under the Court's Local Rules, Plaintiff's response to Defendant's motion 21 should have been filed by no later than March 18, 2015. Civ. L.R. 7-3(a). To date, no 22 opposition has been filed by Plaintiff. Although Plaintiff's lack of response may be

construed as a consent to the relief sought in Defendant's motion, the preferable course of

action in this instance is to consider the motion on the merits. See Omstead v. Dell, Inc.,

594 F.3d 1081, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010). Accordingly,

25 | 26 |

//

23

24

27

28