5

24 |

14 JUN 26 - AN 9: 27

OF THE CALFORNIA

DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

VS.

JAMES EUSSE, JR.,

MARCO VITELA, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 13cv916 BEN (NLS)

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

[Docket Nos. 18, 21, 23]

On February 28, 2014, Defendants E. Duarte, M. Carpio, R. Nelson, G. Janda, M. Whitman, and M. Vitela filed a motion to dismiss portions of Plaintiff James Eusse, Jr.'s First Amended Complaint. (Docket No. 18.) On April 28, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint. (Docket No. 21.) On June 10, 2014, Magistrate Judge Nita L. Stormes issued a Report and Recommendation recommending the Court grant Plaintiff James Eusse, Jr.'s motion for leave to file a second amended complaint and deny Defendants' motion to dismiss as moot. (Docket No. 23.) Any objections to the Report and Recommendation were due June 24, 2014. (*Id.*) Neither party has filed any objections. For the reasons that follow, the Report and Recommendation is **ADOPTED**.

A district judge "may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition" of a magistrate judge on a dispositive matter. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). "The district judge must determine de novo any part of the [report and recommendation] that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). However, "[t]he statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo it objection is made, but not otherwise." United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (emphasis in original); see also Wang v. Masaitis, 416 F.3d 992, 1000 n.13 (9th Cir. 2005). "Neither the Constitution nor the statute requires a district judge to review, de novo, findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept as correct." Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d at 1121.

In the absence of any objections, the Court fully **ADOPTS** Judge Stormes' Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is GRANTED, and Defendants' motion to dismiss is DENIED as moot.

Plaintiff shall file his second amended complaint on or before July 25, 2014.

16

17

13

14

15

IT IS SO ORDERED.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

DATED: June 5, 2014

United States District Judge

27 28