

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 Michael Carroll, et al.

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 Cheri L. Hubka Sparhawk, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No.: 17cv2020-CAB-AGS

**ORDER: (1) ADOPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION [Doc.
No. 25]; AND (2) GRANTING
MOTION FOR ORDER
APPROVING COMPROMISE OF
CLAIM OF MINORS [Doc. No. 23]**

17
18 On January 11, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a motion for order approving compromise of
19 claim of minors. [Doc. No. 23.] On January 31, 2019, Magistrate Judge Andrew G.
20 Schopler prepared a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the
21 motion for order approving compromise of claim of minors be granted. [Doc. No. 25.]
22 The Report also ordered that any objections were to be filed by February 14, 2019.
23 [Report at 2.] To date, no objection has been filed, nor have there been any requests for
24 an extension of time in which to file an objection.

25 A district court’s duties concerning a magistrate judge’s report and
26 recommendation and a respondent’s objections thereto are set forth in Rule 72(b) of the
27 Federal rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no objections are
28 filed, the district court is not required to review the magistrate judge’s report and

1 recommendation. The Court reviews *de novo* those portions of the Report and
2 Recommendation to which objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may
3 “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by
4 the magistrate judge.” *Id.* However, “[t]he statute makes it clear that the district judge
5 must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations *de novo* if objection is
6 made, but not otherwise.” *United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th
7 Cir.2003) (en banc) (emphasis in original). “Neither the Constitution nor the statute
8 requires a district judge to review, *de novo*, findings and recommendations that the
9 parties themselves accept as correct.” *Id.* In the absence of timely objection, the Court
10 “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to
11 accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (citing
12 *Campbel v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)).

13 Here, neither party has timely filed objections to the Report. Having reviewed it,
14 the Court finds that it is thorough, well-reasoned, and contains no clear error.
15 Accordingly, the Court hereby (1) **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Schopler’s Report and
16 Recommendation; and (2) **GRANTS** the motion for order approving compromise of
17 claim of minors.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: February 20, 2019



Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo
United States District Judge