

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**

\* \* \*


ROBERT JACKSON  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00995-APG-NJK  
  
**ORDER ON REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**  
  
(ECF. Nos. 34, 53)

On April 3, 2018, Magistrate Judge Koppe entered a report and recommendation that I deny without prejudice plaintiff Robert Jackson’s motion for temporary restraining order because he did not address or establish all factors needed obtain a restraining order. ECF No. 53. Jackson 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)).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judge Koppe’s report and recommendation (ECF No. 53) is accepted. Plaintiff Robert Jackson’s motion for temporary restraining order (ECF No. 34) is DENIED without prejudice.

DATED this 26th day of April, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE