

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

* * *

JAWVAN E. COOK,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00256-APG-CWH

**ORDER ON REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**


(ECF. No. 21)

On September 29, 2017, Magistrate Judge Hoffman entered a report and recommendation that I dismiss this case with prejudice because plaintiff Jawvan Cook has ceased participating in the case and has not complied with the court’s orders. Cook did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)). I nevertheless conducted a de novo review. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Judge Hoffman sets forth the proper legal analysis and factual basis for the decision.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation (**ECF No. 21**) is **accepted**. Plaintiff Jawvan Cook’s complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

DATED this 21st day of November, 2017.



ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE