

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

Panliant Financial Corporation et. al.,

Case No. 2:12-cv-01376-RFB-CWH

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER**

v.

ISEE3D, Inc. et. al.,

Defendants.

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 156] of the Honorable Carl W. Hoffman, United States Magistrate Judge, entered October 13, 2016.

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 October 30, 2016. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.

...

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 156] is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants Bay Management LTD and Mark Geohegan's Motion for Attorney's Fees (ECF No. 149) is DENIED.

DATED: January 22, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**  
**United States District Judge**