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

Civil Action No. 13-cv-00243-PAB-KLM

JAMIE STAUFFER,

     Plaintiff,

v.

NCC BUSINESS SERVICES, INC., a Florida corporation,

     Defendant.
_____

## ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION
_____

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States

Magistrate Judge Kristen L. Mix filed on May 14, 2013 [Docket No. 19].  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 May 15, 2013.  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. 19] is

accepted.

2.  Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees [Docket No. 15] is granted in part and

denied in part.

3.  Plaintiff is awarded attorney's fees in the amount of $3,825.00.

DATED June 5, 2013.

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).