

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 DAVID B. TURNER,

Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 GEORGE BAILEY DETENTION  
13 CENTER, et al.,

Defendants.  
14  
15

Case No.: 13CV2090 BEN (JLB)

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

[Docket Nos. 51, 52, 69]

16 Plaintiff David B. Turner, proceeding pro se, brought this action under 42 U.S.C. §  
17 1983. The case proceeded as to two claims against two Defendants, James Madsen and  
18 Jill Farris. Motions for summary judgment were filed by Plaintiff and Defendants.  
19 (Docket Nos. 51, 52.) Defendants filed an Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion and a Reply  
20 in support of their Motion. (Docket Nos. 55, 61.) Plaintiff filed a Reply in support of his  
21 own Motion. (Docket No. 60.)


22 On October 23, 2015, Magistrate Judge Jill L. Burkhardt issued a thoughtful and  
23 thorough Report and Recommendation recommending this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion  
24 for Summary Judgment and grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. (Docket  
25 No. 69.) Any objections to the Report and Recommendation were due November 13,  
26 2015. (Id.) No objections have been filed. For the reasons that follow, the Report and  
27 Recommendation is **ADOPTED**.

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

11 The Court need not conduct a de novo review given the absence of objections.  
12 However, the Court has conducted a de novo review and fully **ADOPTS** the Report and  
13 Recommendation. Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED** and  
14 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**. The Clerk shall close the  
15 file.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17  
18 Dated: November 23, 2015

19   
20 Hon. Roger T. Benitez  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27