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

Civil Action No. 09-cv-01295-PAB-MEH

JUSTIN METCALF, WILLIAM CURRIER, and HERMAN CHRISTOPHE, individually and on behalf of similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiffs,

٧.

FCI AND ASSOCIATES, INC., DAN FITCH, and MIKE BUCHART,

Defendants.

ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael H. Hegarty filed on December 18, 2009 [Docket No. 22]. 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 December 21, 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." 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:

- The Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge [Docket No. 22] is ACCEPTED.
  - 2. This case shall be stayed until February 1, 2010.

DATED January 11, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;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).