UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PANLIANT FINANCIAL CORPORATION *et al*, Plaintiffs, vs. ISEE3D, INC. *et al*, Defendant.	Case No.: 2:12-cv-01376-RFB-CWH **ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT & RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE CARL W. HOFFMAN**

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 124) of the Honorable Carl W. Hoffman, United States Magistrate Judge, entered July 28, 2015.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct "any review," *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by August 14, 2015. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation(s).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 124) is **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.**

IT IS ORDERED that (ECF No. 117) Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions is **granted in part and denied in part**. A default shall be entered against Romanica.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that (ECF. No 114) Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall serve this Order on the persons and respective addresses noted in the Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 4th day of September, 2015.

RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
United States District Court