

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

1
2
3 MARIAN ORR, D.O.,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 NEVADA STATE BOARD OF)
8 OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE et al.,)
9 Defendants.)

Case No.: 2:12-cv-2119-GMN-VCF

ORDER

10
11 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States
12 Magistrate Judge Cam Ferenbach (ECF No. 52), entered on December 5, 2016.

13 A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a
14 United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B);
15 D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo
16 determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject,
17 or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge.
18 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is
19 not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an
20 objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized
21 that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation
22 where no objections have been filed. See, e.g., *United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
23 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

24 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

25 Accordingly,

