

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

Civil Action No. 15-cv-0800-PAB-KMT

MARK WALTER PAULSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOUG ROBERTS, Medical Monitor, Private Prison Monitoring Unit, CDOC,  
JERRY STEELE, Private Prison Monitoring Unit, CDOC,  
RICHARD MADRID, Drug and Alcohol/Addiction Services, KCCC (Kit Carson  
Correctional Center),  
PATRICIA HEADLEY, CAC III, Drug and Alcohol/Addiction Services, KCCC,  
L. MORTIN-EARL, MA, CAC III, Drug and Alcohol/Addiction Services, KCCC,  
DESIREE ANDREWS, Health Services Administrator, KCCC,  
KATHY M. WILEY, NP, Health Care Provider, KCCC,  
KAREN C. MITCHELL, NP, Health Care Provider, KCCC,  
DAVID R. GROSS, PA, Health Care Provider, KCCC, and  
SUSAN M. TIONA, MD, Facility Physician, KCCC,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION**

---

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kathleen M. Tafoya filed on February 5, 2018 [Docket No. 186]. 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 5, 2018. 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.”<sup>1</sup> 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. 186] is accepted.
2. Plaintiff’s Motion for Injunction [Docket No. 152] is denied.

DATED March 1, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer  
PHILIP A. BRIMMER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>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).