

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

\* \* \*

ALDEN A. THOMAS, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

KANG AND ASSOCIATES, et al.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-02573-JCM-NJK

ORDER

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Koppe’s report and recommendation to dismiss petitioner’s motion of registration of judgment from another district with prejudice and to deny the application to proceed in forma pauperis as moot. (ECF No. 7). Petitioner filed a timely objection. (ECF No. 8).

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). If a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, however, the court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna–Tapia* as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”).


1 As plaintiff has filed an objection to the report and recommendation, this court finds it  
2 appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine whether to adopt the recommendation of  
3 the magistrate judge. (ECF No. 7). Petitioner’s objections do not address—and thus cannot  
4 overcome—the fact that the judgment he attempts to register appears to be from a court that does  
5 not exist. (ECF No. 2-2). Indeed, the magistrate judge accurately and appropriately cites to  
6 Daniels-Hall v. National Education Association, Federal Rule of Evidence 201, and the website  
7 for the California court system in determining that there is no such thing as an “adjudicator court”  
8 in California. 629 F.3d 992, 998–99 (9th Cir. 2010); see also (ECF Nos. 2-2, 7). Therefore, this  
9 court agrees with the magistrate judge’s analysis and conclusion.

10 Accordingly,

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the report and  
12 recommendation of Magistrate Judge Koppe (ECF No. 7) be, and the same hereby are, ADOPTED  
13 in their entirety.

14 The clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

15 DATED THIS 20th day of January, 2017.

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 JAMES C. MAHAN  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28