

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

10 ANDREW CEJAS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DANIEL PARAMO, et al.,,

14 Defendants.

Case No.: 14-cv-1923-WQH-WVG

ORDER

15 HAYES, Judge:

16 The matter before the Court is the review of the Report and Recommendation issued
17 by United States Magistrate Judge William V. Gallo (ECF No. 115), recommending that
18 Defendants' Motion to Revoke Plaintiff's IFP Status and Dismiss Case (ECF No. 106) be
19 denied.


20 The duties of the district court in connection with a report and recommendation of a
21 magistrate judge are set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28 U.S.C. §
22 636(b). The district judge must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the
23 report . . . to which objection is made," and "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in
24 part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The
25 district court need not review de novo those portions of a Report and Recommendation to
26 which neither party objects. *See Wang v. Masaitis*, 416 F.3d 992, 1000 n.13 (9th Cir. 2005);
27 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("Neither the
28

1 Constitution nor the [Federal Magistrates Act] requires a district judge to review, de novo,
2 findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept as correct.”).

3 No party has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation. The Court has
4 reviewed the Report and Recommendation, the record, and the submissions of the Parties.

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 115) is
6 adopted in its entirety. Defendants’ Motion to Revoke Plaintiff’s IFP Status and Dismiss
7 Case (ECF No. 106) is DENIED.

8 Dated: October 8, 2019


9 Hon. William Q. Hayes
10 United States District Court

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28