

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 JOSEPH HICKS, )  
4 )  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. )  
7 CRS SERVICES, LTD., et al., )  
8 Defendants. )

Case No.: 2:14-cv-01808-GMN-NJK

ORDER

9  
10 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States  
11 Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, (ECF No. 14), which recommends that Plaintiff Joseph  
12 Hicks’ case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

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 objection.”  
20 *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a  
21 district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where  
22 no objections have been filed. See, e.g., *United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122  
23 (9th Cir. 2003).


24 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. Accordingly,  
25 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 14) is

1 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** to the extent that it is not inconsistent with this Order.

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff Joseph Hicks' case is **DISMISSED**  
3 **without prejudice.**

4 **DATED** this 29th day of April, 2015.

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



---

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
United States District Judge