

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

Civil Action No. 14-cv-0847-WJM-MJW

HEATHER LUCIER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., and  
MIDLAND FUNDING LLC,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING OCTOBER 2, 2014 RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE AND DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT  
AGREEMENT**

---

This matter is before the Court on the October 2, 2014 Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe (the "Recommendation") (ECF No. 32) that Defendants' Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (ECF No. 21) be denied. 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. 32 at 7.) 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. 32) is ADOPTED in its entirety;
- (2) Defendants’ Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (ECF No. 21) is DENIED.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2014.

BY THE COURT:



---

William J. Martínez  
United States District Judge