

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Judge Philip A. Brimmer**

Civil Action No. 08-cv-00299-PAB-BNB

ERIC MARSHALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEVIN MILYARD, Warden,  
FLOYD WAID, West CC Manager,  
M. NEGLEY, Captain/Shift Commander,  
STEVEN BADE, Lt.,  
JAMES FRYER, Correctional Officer, and  
ANTHONY DECESARO, Grievance Officer,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION**

---

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland filed on September 18, 2009 [Docket No. 84]. The Recommendation states that objections to the Recommendation must be filed within ten days after its service on the parties. See *also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The Recommendation was served on September 18, 2009. No party has objected to the Recommendation.

In the absence of an objection, the district court may review a magistrate judge's recommendation under any standard it deems appropriate. *Summers v. Utah*, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991); see *also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) ("[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”). In this matter, I have reviewed the Recommendation to satisfy myself that there is “no clear error on the face of the record.”<sup>1</sup> See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes. Based on this review, I have concluded that the Recommendation is a correct application of the facts and the law. Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge [Docket No. 84] is ACCEPTED.

2. Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction [Docket No. 50] and Amended Motion for Preliminary Injunction [Docket No. 51] are DENIED.

DATED December 4, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer  
PHILIP A. BRIMMER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>This standard of review is something less than a “clearly erroneous or contrary to law” standard of review, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), which in turn is less than a *de novo* review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).