

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

\* \* \*

NATHAN CAMPBELL SR.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-1446 JCM (VCF)

ORDER

Presently before the court is the matter of *Campbell Sr. v. Regional Justice Center, et al.*, case number 2:17-cv-01446-JCM-VCF. *Pro se* plaintiff Nathan Campbell Sr filed this action on May 17, 2017. (ECF No. 1). However, plaintiff did not pay the filing fee, nor did he apply to proceed *in forma pauperis*, as this court advised him to do. (ECF No. 2).

On May 6, 2020, Magistrate Judge Cam Ferenbach instructed plaintiff to either pay the filing fee or file an *in forma pauperis* application on or before June 5, 2020. (ECF No. 3). Judge Ferenbach warned plaintiff that failure to do so could result in dismissal. *Id.* Judge Ferenbach now recommends dismissing this action. (ECF No. 4).

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). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the court is required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Where a party fails to object, 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

1 magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United*  
2 *States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review  
3 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no  
4 objections were made).

5 Because plaintiff did not object to Judge Ferenbach's recommendation, the court may  
6 properly adopt it without review. Nevertheless, this court conducted a *de novo* review to determine  
7 whether to adopt the recommendation of the magistrate judge. Upon reviewing the  
8 recommendation and attendant circumstances, this court finds good cause to adopt the magistrate  
9 judge's findings in full.

10 Accordingly,

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Judge Ferenbach's R&R  
12 (ECF No. 4) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the matter of *Campbell Sr. v. Regional Justice Center,*  
14 *et al.*, case number 2:17-cv-01446-JCM-VCF, be, and the same hereby is, DISMISSED.

15 The clerk is instructed to close the case accordingly.

16 DATED July 24, 2020.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28