

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 JABLONSKI ENTERPRISES, LTD.,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 NYE COUNTY, NEVADA, et al.,)
8 Defendants.)
9)
10)

Case No.: 2:15-cv-02296-GMN-GWF

ORDER

11 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable United
12 States Magistrate Judge George Foley, Jr., (ECF No. 104), regarding Defendant Clayton P.
13 Burst’s (“Burst”) and Defendants Lithium Corporation (“Lithium”), Summa, LLC (“Summa”),
14 and Henry Tonking’s (“Tonking”) Motions for Attorney’s Fees, (ECF Nos. 69, 70).

15 A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a
16 United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B);
17 D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo
18 determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject,
19 or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge.
20 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is
21 not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an
22 objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized
23 that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation
24 where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
25 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

1 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

2 Accordingly,

3 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 104), is
4 **ADOPTED** in full.


5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Brust's Motion for Attorney's Fees,
6 (ECF No. 69), is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**. Plaintiff shall pay the total sum of
7 \$1,639.25 and is ordered to make the payment to Defendants by October 2, 2017.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's request for sanctions is **DENIED**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants Lithium, Summa, and Tonking's
10 Motion for Attorney's Fees, (ECF No. 70), is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**.
11 Plaintiff is ordered to pay the total sum of \$2,016.00, and is ordered to make the payment to
12 Defendants by October 2, 2017.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants' request for sanctions is **DENIED**.

14 **DATED** this 12 day of September, 2017.

15
16 
17 _____
18 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
19 United States District Court
20
21
22
23
24
25