Johnson v. Artemis, et al Doc. 85

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO Judge William J. Martínez

Civil Action No. 12-cv-01359-WJM-KLM

LARRY ELEVTHERIOS JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

٧.

ELIZABETH ARTEMIS, MELANIE DAVIES, KAMILA DAVIES, KIMBERLEE PRATT, NICOLE STANIC, ROMANEE STANIC, and KAITLYN NOLAN

Defendants.

## ORDER ADOPTING JUNE 19, 2013 RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND HIS AMENDED COMPLAINT

This matter is before the Court on the June 19, 2013 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kristen L. Mix (the "Recommendation") (ECF No. 81) that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend his Amended Complaint (ECF No. 77) be denied. The Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The Recommendation advised the parties that specific written objections were due within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the Recommendation. (ECF No. 81, at 10-11) Despite this advisement, no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation have to date been received.

The Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's analysis was thorough and sound, and that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note ("When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation."); see also Summers v. Utah, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991) ("In the absence of timely objection, the district court may review a magistrate's report under any standard it deems appropriate.").

In accordance with the foregoing, the Court ORDERS as follows:

- (1) The Magistrate Judge's Recommendation (ECF No. 81) is ADOPTED in its entirety;
- (2) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend his Amended Complaint (ECF No. 77) is DENIED.
  Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

William J. Martínez

United States District Judge