

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 THOMAS ELGAS,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 RICHARD STRAUB,)
8 Defendant.)

Case No.: 2:15-cv-0433-GMN-CWH

ORDER

9
10 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States
11 Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman, (ECF No. 3), which states that this case should be
12 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
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,

1 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 3), is
2 **ADOPTED** in full.

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. The
4 Clerk is instructed to enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

5 **DATED** this 24th day of September, 2015.

6
7 

8 _____
9 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
10 United States District Court
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25