

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

Civil Action No. 09-cv-01501-PAB-KLM

CARLO CELANI,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARK EHRLE, Aurora Police Dept.,
ADAM NEUMEYER, Aurora Police Dept., and
JOHN DOES 1-5, Aurora Police Dept.

Defendants.

ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Amended Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kristen L. Mix filed on May 24, 2010 [Docket No. 59]. The Recommendation states that objections to the Recommendation must be filed within fourteen days after its service on the parties. *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The Recommendation was served on May 24, 2010. On June 15, 2010 the Court granted plaintiff's request for additional time to object to the Amended Recommendation, granting an extension until July 30, 2010 [Docket No. 62]. 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.”¹ 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 Amended Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge [Docket No. 59] is ACCEPTED.

2. Defendant Mark Ehrle’s Motion to Dismiss [Docket No. 26] is GRANTED, and the case against defendant Ehrle is dismissed.

DATED August 12, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

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

¹This 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).