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

Civil Action No. 13-cv-01701-PAB-BNB

CHRISTOPHER JAMES WILDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONS OFFICERS 1-10,
FEDERAL CORRECTIONS COUNSELORS 1-3,
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL LIEUTENANT,
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL ASSISTANT WARDENS 1-3,
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL WARDEN, and
UNKNOWN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES 1-10,

Defendants.

ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland filed on February 18, 2014 [Docket No. 45]. 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 February 19, 2014. 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. 45] is ACCEPTED.

2. Plaintiff may amend his Complaint to name Charles Daniels and Lieutenant Borges as defendants. Plaintiff shall file his amended complaint naming these two defendants (and not the dismissed defendants) on or before April 11, 2014.

3. The United States Marshal is directed to serve defendants Daniels and Borges.

4. All remaining defendants are dismissed without prejudice.

DATED March 13, 2014.

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).