

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Judge Christine M. Arguello**

Civil Action No. 13-cv-02961-CMA-MJW

HAZHAR A. SAYED,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERTA BROMAN, an individual,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING AND AFFIRMING JUNE 9, 2014  
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

---

This matter is before the Court on the June 9, 2014 Recommendation by United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend/Alter Judgment of 1/30/14, Dismissing Claim One (Doc. # 18) be denied. (Doc. # 38.) The Recommendation is incorporated herein by reference. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). On June 18, 2014, Plaintiff Hazhar Sayed filed an objection to the Recommendation. (Doc. # 41.)

“When a magistrate judge issues a recommendation on a dispositive matter, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) requires that the district judge “determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s [recommended] disposition that has been properly objected to.” In conducting its review, “[t]he district judge may accept, reject, or modify the

recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” *Id.*

In the instant case, Plaintiff does not “properly object[]” to any part of the Recommendation. Instead, he reiterates arguments that were properly before Magistrate Judge Watanabe at the time his Recommendation issued. Nonetheless, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this matter, including reviewing all relevant pleadings, the Recommendation, and Plaintiff’s objection thereto. Based on this *de novo* review, the Court concludes that Judge Watanabe’s Recommendation is correct and is not called into question by Plaintiff’s objection.


Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff’s objection (Doc. # 41) is OVERRULED. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe (Doc. # 38) is AFFIRMED and ADOPTED as an Order of this Court. Pursuant to the Recommendation, it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend/Alter Judgment of 1/30/14, Dismissing Claim One (Doc. # 18) is DENIED.

DATED: August 6, 2014

BY THE COURT:



---

CHRISTINE M. ARGUELLO  
United States District Judge

