




1 *Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review  
2 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no  
3 objections were made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D.  
4 Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the view that  
5 district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an  
6 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then  
7 the court may accept the recommendation without review. *See, e.g., Johnstone*, 263 F.  
8 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to  
9 which no objection was filed).

10 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to  
11 determine whether to adopt Judge Hoffman's R&R. Upon reviewing the R&R and  
12 underlying motion, this Court finds good cause to adopt Judge Hoffman's  
13 recommendation in full. From Plaintiff's most recent application (dkt. no. 6) it appears as  
14 though Plaintiff is able to pay the costs of commencing this action.

15 It is therefore ordered that the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge  
16 Carl W. Hoffman (dkt. no. 7) be accepted and adopted in its entirety. Plaintiff's Motion for  
17 Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (dkt. no. 6) is denied.

18 DATED THIS 13<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014.

19  
20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 MIRANDA M. DU  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28