

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

Civil Action No. 09-cv-01940-PAB-MJW

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JONI K. D'ANDREA,  
HOWARD MITCHELL GILBERT, and  
PUBLIC SERVICE CREDIT UNION,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION**

---

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe filed on March 31, 2010 [Docket No. 55]. 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 March 31, 2010. 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. 55] is ACCEPTED.

2. The Motion for Entry of Default on Defendant Howard Mitchell Gilbert’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 52] is DENIED. Each party shall bear its own attorney’s fees and costs for the motion.

DATED May 10, 2010.

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).