Hampton v. Perez et al Doc. 102

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO Judge Christine M. Arguello

Civil Action No. 07-cv-01732-CMA-MEH

NATHANIEL HAMPTON,

Plaintiff,

٧.

PEREZ, CPO, UNKNOWN NAMED COP, D.O.C., CM, PAROLE BOARD APPEAL REVIEWING OFFICERS on Dec. 19, 2006, WATERS, Parole Board Hearing Officer, and MARK ALLISON, CPO,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING AND AFFIRMING APRIL 6, 2009 RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Combined Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum Brief In Support of Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint (Doc. # 64), filed November 17, 2008. The motion was referred to Magistrate Judge Michael E. Hegarty for a Recommendation by Order of Reference dated November 17, 2008. Magistrate Judge Hegarty issued a Recommendation on April 6, 2009 that the above-referenced motion be granted. (Recommendation at 1.) The Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b).

The Recommendation advised the parties that specific written objections were due within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the Recommendation.

(Recommendation at 1.) Despite this advisement, no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation were filed by either party.

"In the absence of timely objection, the district court may review a magistrate. . . [judge's] report under any standard it deems appropriate." *Summers v. Utah*, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (stating that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings").

Applying this standard, I am satisfied that the Recommendation of Magistrate

Judge Hegarty is sound and that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See

Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(a). I agree that the above-referenced motion to dismiss should be

granted. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael E. Hegarty (Doc. # 97), filed April 6, 2009, is AFFIRMED and ADOPTED.

In accordance therewith, it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Combined Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum Brief In Support of Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint (Doc. # 64), filed November 17, 2008 GRANTED, and this case is hereby DISMISSED.

FURTHER, this Court DECLINES to excercise supplemental jurisdiction over any state claims in this matter.

DATED: April <u>22</u>, 2009

BY THE COURT:

CHRISTINE M. ARGUELLO United States District Judge

Christme Magnello