

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

* * *

RICHARD HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

COX, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-00460-RFB-CWH

ORDER

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 65] of the Honorable Carl W. Hoffman, United States Magistrate Judge, entered October 19, 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 November 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. 65] is
ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Catherine Cortez-
Masto be DISMISSED without prejudice.

The Clerk of Court is directed to serve a copy of this Order upon Plaintiff.

DATED: January 22, 2017.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
United States District Judge