

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

* * *

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| JIMMIE D. BELK, | Case No. 2:15-CV-543 JCM (CWH) |
| Plaintiff(s), | ORDER |
| v. | |
| FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, | |
| Defendant(s). | |

Presently before the court are Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation. (Doc. # 4). Plaintiff Jimmie Belk filed an objection. (Doc. # 6).

On April 6, 2015, Magistrate Judge Hoffman granted plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and ordered the clerk of court to file plaintiff’s complaint. (Doc. # 1-1). Magistrate Judge Hoffman recommended that plaintiff’s complaint be dismissed with prejudice because “Plaintiff’s complaint is fanciful, based on delusional factual scenarios, and fails to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. (Doc. # 6).

Plaintiff filed an objection that he would like to have \$14 billion, a chalk board, four engineers, and twelve science teachers to show the court how he can help the federal government to solve the drought and end hunger.

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

1 “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S.
2 140, 149 (1985).

3 The court finds that Magistrate Judge Hoffman did not err in recommending that plaintiff’s
4 complaint be dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff’s complaint simply states that it offers a
5 “solution” to the apparent misuse of the water supply in Lake Mead and an unidentified problem
6 at the “U.S. and Mexico border.” Plaintiff makes no request for any type of relief, nor could he.


7 Therefore, after reviewing Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report, defendant’s objections, and
8 the underlying complaint de novo, the court adopts the report and recommendation in full.

9 Accordingly,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Magistrate Judge
11 Hoffman’s report and recommendation (doc. # 4) be, and the same hereby are, ADOPTED in full.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff’s complaint (doc. # 1-1) be, and the same
13 hereby is, DISMISSED with prejudice.

14 DATED July 1, 2015.

15 
16 _____
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE