

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Senior Judge Wiley Y. Daniel

Civil Action No. 13-cv-01309-WYD-MEH

KILLER JOE NEVADA, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,

v.

CEDRIC RADELJAN,

Defendant.

**ORDER AFFIRMING AND ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment against Defendant Cedric Radeljan (ECF No. 54). In his Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Hegarty recommends that the pending motion be granted in part and denied in part. (Recommendation at 1, 16). The Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Magistrate Judge Hegarty advised the parties that written objections were due within fourteen (14) days after service of a copy of the Recommendation. (Recommendation at 1). Despite this advisement, no objections were filed to the Recommendation. No objections having been filed, I am vested with discretion to review the Recommendation "under any standard [I] deem[] appropriate." *Summers v. Utah*, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991); see also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (stating that "[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"). Nonetheless, though not required to do so, I review the Recommendation to "satisfy [my]self that there is no clear error on the face of the record."¹ See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) Advisory Committee Notes.

Having reviewed the Recommendation, I am satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. I find that Magistrate Judge Hegarty's Recommendation is thorough, well reasoned and sound. I agree with Magistrate Judge Hegarty that the pending motion should be granted in part and denied in part for the reasons stated in both the Recommendation and this Order.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Hegarty (ECF No. 60) is **AFFIRMED** and **ADOPTED**. In accordance therewith, it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment against Defendant Cedric Radeljan (ECF No. 54) is **DENIED IN PART AND GRANTED IN PART** as follows:

1. Judgment shall enter in Plaintiff's favor against Defendant Radeljan for direct copyright infringement of the Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture, as set forth in Count I of the Second Amended Complaint;

2. Defendant Radeljan shall pay to Plaintiff the sum of \$4,500.00 in statutory damages, as authorized by 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1), and \$3,039.70 for attorney's fees and costs as authorized by 17 U.S.C. § 505;

¹ Note, 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).

3. Defendant Radeljan shall remove and permanently delete all torrent files relating to, and copies of, Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture made or used by him in violation of Plaintiff's exclusive rights, as well as all masters in their possession, custody or control from which such copies may be reproduced; and

4. Plaintiff's request to permanently enjoin Defendant from continuing to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture is **DENIED**.

Dated: April 22, 2014

BY THE COURT:

s/ Wiley Y. Daniel
WILEY Y. DANIEL,
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE