

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 TERENCE RADFORD VIERNES,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting)
8 Commissioner of Social Security,)
9 Defendant.)

Case No.: 2:14-cv-1541-GMN-PAL

ORDER

10
11 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States
12 Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen (ECF No. 24), entered on November 30, 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,

