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

Civil Action No. 12-cv-00607-PAB-CBS

EARL K. MADSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARRY DASHNER,

Defendant.

ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Craig B. Shaffer filed on January 30, 2014 [Docket No. 42]. 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 January 30, 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. 42] is ACCEPTED.

2. Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Judgment Against Defendant Dashner [Docket No. 38] is GRANTED.

3. Judgment shall be entered pursuant to the Settlement Agreement in favor of plaintiff and against defendant in the amount of $325,000.00 in liquidated damages.

DATED February 20, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

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

[1]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).