

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**

CHRISTOPHER DUGGAN,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendant(s).

2:14-CV-487 JCM (VCF)

ORDER

Presently before the court are the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Ferenbach. (Doc. # 2). No objections have been filed even though the deadline for filing objections has passed.

After granting *pro se* plaintiff Christopher Duggan’s motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach recommended that the complaint be dismissed for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). (Doc. # 2).

This 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). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

