

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

Civil Action No. 11-cv-01734-PAB-BNB

DANIEL LEROY RHODEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

RYAN O'HAYRE and
STUART RUYBAL,

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 March 4, 2014 [Docket No. 82]. The Recommendation states that objections to the Recommendation must be filed within fourteen days after its service on the parties. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The Recommendation was served on March 4, 2014. 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. See *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, the Court has reviewed the

Recommendation to satisfy itself that there is “no clear error on the face of the record.”¹
Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes. Based on this review, the Court has
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. 82] is
ACCEPTED.

2. Defendants Ryan O’Hayre and Stuart Ruybal’s Motion for Summary
Judgment [Docket No. 77] is GRANTED. Plaintiff’s first claim for relief is dismissed with
prejudice. Plaintiff’s fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh claims for relief are dismissed
without prejudice.²

3. This case is CLOSED.

DATED March 24, 2014.

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).

²Plaintiff’s second and third claims for relief were previously dismissed. Docket
No. 51.