

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

Civil Action No. 13-cv-1447-WJM-KLM

ISAAC MORADI, individually and as trustee for the Moradi Family Trust,
FOROUGH MORADI, as trustee for the Saeed and Forough Moradi Family Trust,
MIKE MORADI,
KATINA MORADI,
ALBERT MORADI,
CAROLINE MORADI,
I&J PARTNERSHIP, LP, and
610 SOUTH MAIN, LLC,

Plaintiffs/Counterclaim Defendants,
v.

ESTATE OF EVERETT LEROY PFEIFF, and
LINDA PFEIFF, individually and as personal representative of the Estate of Everett Leroy
Pfeiff,

Defendants, and
OLDE WORLD DEVELOPMENT, LLC.,
Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.

**ORDER ADOPTING JULY 7, 2014 RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO AMEND**

This matter is before the Court on the July 7, 2014 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kristen L. Mix (the "Recommendation") (ECF No. 101) that Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion to Amend First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 97) be granted. 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. 101 at 2.) 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. 101) is ADOPTED in its entirety;
- (2) Plaintiff's Motion Unopposed Motion to Amend First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 97) is GRANTED; and
- (3) Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint and Jury Demand (ECF No. 97-2) is ACCEPTED as filed and is now the operative complaint in this action.

Dated this 30th day of July, 2014.

BY THE COURT:



William J. Martínez
United States District Judge