

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Judge Raymond P. Moore**

Civil Action No. 13-cv-00201-RM-KLM

HILLARY VALLES,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEN-X ECHO B, INC. d/b/a GENX,  
MARTIN COLLAZO RANGEL, and  
EAGLE CLAW SECURITY LLC and ARACELI GALEOTE, its owner,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE (ECF NOS. 48 & 53)**

---

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on: (1) the September 27, 2013 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (“First Recommendation”) (ECF No. 48) on “Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File Her Third Amended Complaint by Adding New Party Defendant GenX Clothing, Inc.” (ECF No. 41); and (2) the October 8, 2013 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (“Second Recommendation”) (ECF No. 53) on Defendant Gen-X Echo B, Inc.’s “Partial Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)” (ECF No. 12) (collectively, “Recommendations”). The Recommendations are incorporated herein by reference. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).

The Recommendations advised the parties that specific written objections were due within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the Recommendations. (ECF No. 48, pages 12-13 & No. 53, page 17.) No objections to the Recommendations have to date been filed by any party and the time to do so has expired.

The Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's analysis in both Recommendations was thorough and sound, and that there is no clear error of law or abuse of discretion. *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,

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. The Magistrate Judge's First Recommendation (ECF No. 48) and Second Recommendation (ECF No. 53) are **ADOPTED** in their entirety and made an order of this Court;
2. The Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File her Third Amended Complaint by Adding New Party Defendant GenX Clothing, Inc. (ECF No. 41) is **DENIED**;  
and

3. Defendant Gen-X Echo B, Inc.'s Partial Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) (ECF No. 12) is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's **Fourth Cause of Action** for negligent hiring and negligent retention is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

DATED this 30th day of October, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Raymond P. Moore", written over a horizontal line.

RAYMOND P. MOORE  
United States District Judge