

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * *

4 RICHARD LEE SATERSTAD,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY,

8 Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01947-APG-CWH

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION AND
DISMISSING THE PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT**

(ECF No. 13)

10
11 On March 1, 2018, Magistrate Judge Hoffman issued a report and recommendation in
12 which he recommends that I dismiss plaintiff Richard Lee Saterstad's complaint with prejudice
13 because it is time-barred. Saterstad did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct
14 a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district
15 courts to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed
16 findings to which objection is made"); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th
17 Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and
18 recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise" (emphasis in original)).

19 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Hoffman's report and
20 recommendation (**ECF No. 13**) is accepted. Plaintiff Richard Lee Saterstad's complaint is
21 DISMISSED with prejudice.

22 DATED this 2nd day of April, 2018.

23
24 
25 ANDREW P. GORDON
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28